

DISTURBING PRAXIS:
A FOUCAULDIAN ANALYSIS OF
STUDENT SUBJECTIVITIES AND CLASSROOM PEDAGOGIES
IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

By
Sheelah McLean

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Educational Foundations

College of Education

University of Saskatchewan

© Copyright by Sheelah McLean 2016

Abstract

This research combines self-study methodology with a Foucauldian analysis in order to investigate the relationship between nationalist discourses, teacher/student subjectivity, and the teaching and learning of integrative antiracism. Drawing from Michel Foucault's theory of subjectivation this self-study examined student discourses of learning in relation to an integrative antiracist course I taught over a 6-year period in two schools located on the Canadian prairies. Using discourse analysis of 16 participant interviews, my research questions asked: *How do students describe their experiences of learning in a course where spaces were created for a critical reading of the world?* And *what subject positions were made available through their words?* An important aspect of the study of discourse is an examination of how the self and/or others are constructed through accounts that are readily available. This research examined how students that occupy positions of dominance were instantiated and performed themselves as (even better) Canadian subjects through their management of discourse.

This research shows how state discourses of nationalism, individualism, liberalism, and benevolence regulated the way that students and I performed social justice. Our negotiations of the "good teacher," the "good student," and the "good citizen" were performatively constituted through discursive frames of whiteness and heteronormativity. In particular, I will show how the students management of language was a form of self-surveillance that reified their position as dominant citizen-subjects. In constituting themselves as both innocent and superior, students embodied the discursive practices of the benevolent white settler state. This self-study allows me to analyze the everyday practices of subject formation and think about the power relations that are at play in a classroom setting.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank a number of people without whom this work would not have been possible. My brilliant supervisors, Dr. Verna St. Denis and Dr. Alex Wilson who have generously provided their knowledge, support, and friendship. I am very grateful for your expertise and guidance over the years. I also had an amazing committee who all mentored me in different ways. Dr. Carol Schick was my teacher in antiracism and helped shape this work in important ways. Dr. Maggie Kovach taught me Indigenous Research Methodologies and has been a huge support to me over the years, and Dr. Geraldine Balzer who was my mentor during my secondment in Curriculum Studies. Thank you to each of you for everything you have taught me.

I would like to thank the faculty in Educational Foundations, in particular Dr. Dianne Miller and Professor Bob Regnier, for the support they have given to my career. The opportunities to teach both undergraduate and graduate students as a sessional instructor have been important factors in my ongoing passion for integrative antiracist education.

Thank you to all the students who ventured on this journey with me. This is one interpretation of our story. I hope you learn as much from reading this as I have from writing it. I know many of you were interested in learning more about integrative antiracism. This research is a chance for us to continue to learn together.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends, especially my two daughters Morgan Brynn and Devan Leigh, and my mom Olive McLean. This journey has demanded the patience and love of many people. I could not have done this without your support.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Context of the Study.....	4
Nation Building Practices.....	6
Schooling the Nation	8
What Kind of Education?	11
AGC30 Program Curriculum and Practices	16
Outline of the Dissertation	21
Chapter 2: Power Relations in Pedagogy.....	25
Introduction	25
Part I: Power/Knowledge and Humanism in Education.....	28
Part II: Schools as Disciplinary Practices	33
Disciplinary Techniques.....	35
The Pedagogy of Subject Making	37
Agency and Performativity	40
Conclusion.....	43
Chapter 3: Self-Study Research Methodology	45
Introduction	45
Troubling “the Self” in Self-Study	46
Historical Roots of Self-Study	48
Self-Study and Related Qualitative Methodologies	50
The Epistemology and Ontology of Self-Study	53
Self-Study Methods.....	56
Discourse Analysis	59
Coding: Themes and sub-themes.....	60
Language and subjection.	62
Conclusion.....	65
Chapter 4: Situating Myself in the Study.....	67
Reflecting Back	68
Practices of the Self.....	76
Shifting Pedagogies	80
Chapter 5: Regulating Bodies; Making Docile Subjects	86
Hierarchal Observation: Teaching as Authority.....	88
Normalizing Judgment: Making “Good” Students	93
The Regulation and Production of Docile Bodies.....	96
Power/Knowledge and Textbooks	100
The Examination	105
Panopticism: Bodies and Spaces	109
Surveillance/Self-Surveillance	113
Conclusion.....	116

Chapter 6: Canadian Nationalism and Racial Formations	118
Part I: The Regulation of Nationalist Discourses in Public Schools	120
Proud to be Canadian.....	121
Multiculturalism as a state narrative.....	123
Cultural difference.....	126
Meritocracy and whiteness.....	129
Our home on native land.....	132
Part II: Disrupting Nationalist Discourses: On Being Good, Feeling Good	136
Conclusion.....	143
Chapter 7: Queering Subjects	144
Part I: The White Heteropatriarchal Gaze	147
The Good Family	148
Performing Gender	150
Body rituals.....	151
Hypermasculinity.....	153
Part II: Discourse of Silence.....	156
Conclusion.....	161
Chapter 8: Practices of Empire	163
Part I: Good citizenship.....	165
State subjects and active citizenship.....	166
Charity versus justice.....	168
Bad activists.....	172
Part II: Global Citizens.....	175
White saviors.....	178
Conclusion.....	181
Chapter 9: Conclusion.....	183
Chapter 9: Conclusion.....	183
Teaching as a Practice of Self-Exaltation.....	184
Agency and Resistance.....	188
Disturbing Praxis.....	190
Social Justice Activism in Schools.....	194
Self-Study Research in Social Justice Education	197
Call to Action in Education	198
References.....	200
Appendix A.....	221
Appendix B	222
Appendix C	225
Appendix D.....	226

Chapter 1: Introduction

This dissertation was written during the first 3 years of the grassroots revolution called Idle No More. The movement, which quickly became a global call for the protection of Indigenous sovereignty and territories, is led by the guidance and wisdom of Indigenous women and Two-Spirit people using community education and strategic actions to challenge colonial state practices and support Indigenous resurgence. As one of the organizers working in solidarity with the movement, I have witnessed the significance of public education in disrupting dominant narratives and providing alternative discourses, but also how state institutions such as schools are implicated in reproducing relations of dominance and oppression. I have gained a deep and profound respect for the activists, teachers, and community members who continue to face and resist ongoing colonial violence, many times at a cost to their health, families, and lives. My own journey towards solidarity work has been long, and requires continued lifelong struggle, work, and study. I am forever grateful for the generosity and patience of my many teachers along the way. It is in the spirit of solidarity work with Idle No More organizers that this dissertation is written.

Idle No More has been described as yet another wave in a 500 year old resistance to colonial systems of white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, and capitalist orders of accumulation and consumption. Nation building practices have produced vast inequalities, advancing the social and economic power of white settler subjects, in particular those who were male and propertied, while dispossessing Indigenous people and subjugating groups marked as “Other” (Leonardo, 2009; Ng, 1993; Thobani, 2007).

The discursive formations of national identity and citizenship, coded by race and sexuality, have

been mapped onto bodies, creating internal and external exclusions (Dhamoon, 2009; Stoler, 1995; Weems, 2004). These practices have served to reproduce hierarchies that normalize white heteropatriarchy and naturalize hierarchal relations of inequality. The boundary making of colonial relations of power on bodies and spaces continues to be reproduced in various ways, despite ongoing resistance. This research echoes the call from Idle No More organizers to transgress these colonial practices in all of our intimate, family, and organizational relations. The urgent need for critical education as an intervention into colonial violence has significant implications for this study.

The last 10 years of my research and teaching have been spent studying how dominance is reproduced in the everyday interactions between individuals and institutions. I believe integrative antiracist education provides us with important praxis for locating and dismantling these matrices of power. One of the reasons I have an ongoing interest in Foucauldian theories is the possibilities they offer towards a type of freedom. As Foucault (1982) states, “people are freer than they feel, that people accept as truth, as evidence, some of the themes that have been built up at a certain moment in history, and that this so-called evidence can be criticized and destroyed” (p. 10). Foucauldian theories of subjectivity suggest that relations of power which appear to be “natural” can be analyzed as discursive formations that are historically constituted, disrupting essentialism, and notions of inevitability. I agree with Youdell (2010) who states that “These ideas have massive implications for thinking critically about the subject of education and the processes through which enduring inequalities are produced in the performative practices of institutions, teachers and, indeed, students” (p. 225).

Drawing from Michel Foucault’s theory of subjectivation, this self-study research

investigated the discourses of students in relation to an integrative antiracist course I taught in a high school setting called Applied Global Citizenship 30 (AGC30). The course was created to investigate social and ecological justice issues within a context of white settler colonialism. My intention in teaching the course was to provide a social and political analysis that might challenge the students to consider their own positioning in a white settler state which maintains violent practices of colonialism. I chose self-study as a research methodology because it invites teachers to investigate a problem regarding our pedagogy in relation to our students' learning. Over the course of this research, my inquiry shifted from exploring integrative antiracist pedagogy as primarily an intervention, to analyzing how dominance may be maintained because of and in spite of it. The contributions of this self-study can further educational research on the connection between knowledge production and the pedagogical conditions for making a new kind of subject.

Using discourse analysis of student interviews, my research question asks: how do students describe their experiences of learning in a course where spaces were created for a critical reading of the world? And what subject positions are made available to them through their words? This research examined how students that occupy positions of dominance are instantiated and perform themselves as (even better) Canadian subjects through their management of discourse. An important aspect of the study of discourse is an examination of how the self and/or others are constructed through accounts that are readily available. As Wetherell and Potter (1992) contend, the goal of discourse analysis is not to classify people, "but to reveal the discursive practices through which subject categories are constructed and exploitation legitimated" (p. 102). Foucault suggests that power is implicated even in acts of

resistance to domination, which frequently occur “through the very agenda which shapes the domination” (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 84). This means that the teaching and learning of integrative antiracism may reproduce particular relations of power, even when the intention is to unsettle them.

This research also explored how my subjectivity as a teacher is produced through the teaching and research of integrative antiracism. My own location as a white middle-class, cis hetero female engaged in socio-eco justice activism informs this research study. Teachers positioned in structures of dominance are subject to discursive frames of innocence and white heroism. As Schick (2000) details in her research on white women teachers, by becoming a teacher, I was still being loyal to what I learned about identifying as a female, particularly the assumption of caring for others. In working class terms, “moving up” can be justified by the conviction that one is “making a contribution,” “saving the world,” or “making a difference” (p. 303). Each of these justifications is grounded in conserving values that describe qualities of both the teacher and the nation: goodness, tolerance, caring. I will explore my teaching identity further in Chapter 4: Situating Myself in the Study.

Context of the Study

This research took place in an urban setting on the Canadian prairies with student-participants from two different high schools with predominantly white middle class staff and students. The AGC30 course was an elective for Grade 12s that was offered yearly over a 6-year period, which meant that the participants in this study came from a wide range of classes. Each year a small number of students in the AGC30 course identified as Indigenous, mixed race, or students of color. In terms of gender, initially, the majority of the students who chose this course

identified as female, although this changed over the last 2 years of the program. Many students identified as queer and were involved in the Gay-Straight Alliance where I was an advisor at both schools.

Throughout the course students were given opportunities to learn about integrative antiracist theories in order to analyze the discourses that normalize white settler colonialism and the national narratives of Canadian-ness. In a colonial context, white settler subjectivity is co-constructed with Indigeneity, which may be one of the reasons students talked about this relationship extensively in the interviews. As Schick and St. Denis (2005) suggest, in the Canadian prairie context “the largest population produced as ‘Other’ are First Nations peoples . . . even though other visible minority groups also make the area their home” (p. 297). The ways in which the nation and citizenship are produced through racialized and heteronormative discourses determined both the focus of the ACG30 courses I taught and subsequently this research study.

This dissertation is a continuation of my ongoing work to understand subject formation in the context of public education. In my qualitative thesis research, *Beyond the pale: Whiteness as innocence in education*, I drew from post-structural theory to study white teacher subjectivity and racializing discourses in public schools (McLean, 2007). As well, my article titled *The whiteness of green: Racialization and environmental education* (McLean, 2013) draws from Foucauldian theory to investigate how whiteness may be reified in environmental education programs. This research will further build on this work, using Foucault’s theory of subjectivation to examine how the students and I were subject to and performed nationalist discourses.

Nation Building Practices

While Foucault has been critiqued for his omission of colonialism from theories of sexuality and race in the context of Europe, Stoler (1995) contests this limit by tracing how the European bourgeoisie come to know themselves through the constitution of colonial subjects. Stoler (1995) draws from Foucault to examine how sexuality was racialized in the European colonies during the 19th century. This approach shows how difference is constructed relationally and regulated in ways that produce social hierarchies. Many scholars of colonial studies continue to use Foucauldian theories in order to examine how national formations of race, sexuality, and gender produce colonial regimes.

Scholars such as Dhamoon (2009), Mackey (2002), and Thobani (2007) examine how national subjects have been produced through state policies and social practices, constructing white settlers as citizen-subjects, while Indigenous people and people of color are produced as “outsiders” in the Canadian state (Bannerji, 1997). The white settler subject is exalted above all others as the embodiment of the characteristics of the nation and symbol of its values and ethics. As Thobani (2007) states,

There prevails in Canada a master narrative of the nation, which takes as its point of departure the essentially law-abiding character of its enterprising nationals, who are presented, (for the most part) as responsible citizens, compassionate, caring, and committed to the values of diversity and multiculturalism. (p. 4)

These narratives define both the national identity and determine the policies and practices which shape Canada’s social and political landscape. Canadians imagine that state rights are acquired because of their own intrinsic goodness, rather than colonial practices of domination. In fact,

state rights were accorded on the basis of how the national public was produced in relation to gender, race, sexuality, class, and other identity markers (Dhamoon, 2009; Mackey, 2002; Ng, 1993; Stanley, 2006; Stoler, 1995). The discourses of nationalism obscure practices of exclusion that are central to nation building projects.

Histories of domination continue to shape nationhood and citizenship today. The discourses of liberal multiculturalism and tolerance are a constitutive feature of the Canadian national identity. These discourses legitimize the social and political structures of the Canadian state, and mark and regulate the bodies and spaces of problematic Others (Dhamoon, 2009). As Walia (2013) contends,

This casting out within the nation-state is not new or unique; it is evident in the experiences of segregation, internment of Japanese Canadians and Japanese Americans, the War on Drugs, and reserve system. These lived experiences of otherness are shaped by imaginings about who is entitled to protection from the nation-state because they represent the national identity, and who faces violence by the nationstate because their bodies are deemed not to belong. (p. 62)

In particular, the erasure of Indigenous peoples from the landscape through genocidal policies justifies white occupancy and entitles white settlers to claim originary status as the true Canadians (McClean, 2013; Thobani, 2007). These discourses serve to rationalize the continued theft and destruction of Indigenous lands (Wolf, 2006). The Canadian rhetoric of tolerance and multiculturalism that promise a celebration of diversity serve to mask state practices that normalize and maintain systems of white heteropatriarchy (Arvin, Tuck, & Morrill, 2013;

Dhamoon, 2009; St. Denis, 2011). The myth of a unitary national identity works to connect disparate peoples to white settler notions of state jurisdiction, property, and citizenship.

Schooling the Nation

Anti-colonial scholars Bacchus (2006), Kanu (2006), and Richardson (2006) contend that the primary agent in reiterating an essentialist construction of nationhood are educational institutions, and more precisely schooling. Bhabha (1990) argues that pedagogy is central to national identity construction in modern states in which people become the “historical objects of nationalist pedagogy” designed to construct the nation as a fixed and temporally bound space (p. 178). As Richardson (2006) argues,

In most nations, national curricula have been created to perpetuate, and in many cases manufacture, national myths for the twin purposes of grounding national consciousness in some kind of legitimizing historical tradition and garnering the allegiance of the people to the existing status quo. (p. 286)

This imagined community represents a symbolic space that overcomes barriers of geography and difference to create a bond that links individuals to a larger hegemonic identity (Anderson, 1991). This image of the Canadian nation serves to erase the ways in which racialized and gendered practices create deep division within the nation-state (Ng, 1993; Thobani, 2007).

Canada’s national identity has been constructed through an image of the Canadian national subject as white, male, and straight, and our educational institutions play a central role in reifying this construction (Berry, 2007; Leonardo, 2004). As Richardson (2006) points out, the reproduction of a singular image of the nation in school curriculum has “privileged Eurocentrism,” while marginalizing and silencing the histories of Indigenous peoples, women,

ethnic minorities, and queer communities “who are not perceived to be part of the dominant narrative” (p. 284). As Coleman (2006) suggests, English Canadian whiteness is organized around “standardized ideals of whiteness, Britishness, and masculinity” (p. 10) which has normalized the political, social, and economic practices of white settler domination. Anti-colonial scholars have noted that “the nation is both an imagined community and an unfinished project” (Richardson, 2006), which makes the reiteration of colonial logics a continuous concern for the state.

The colonial practices that reproduce inequality are well documented, yet are often absent from public school curriculum and textbooks (Stanley, 2006; Willinsky, 1998). Coleman (2006) maintains that this is due to the fact that innocence is the foundation of our identity as white settler Canadians. As McDonald (2006) contends,

Nationalist discourses transform dramatically different experiences of the nation into a collective narrative that masks histories of genocide, forced displacement, and colonialism, and reinforces a sense of an enclosed nation with an essentialized identity. (p. 304)

These normative cultural practices are pervasive at every institutional level of schooling, from the production of teacher identity to the pedagogical practices used in classrooms. National identity is governed through colonial discourses and must be made and remade through the reproduction of public memory. This is accomplished through spectacle during school assemblies such as Remembrance Day, the use of flags, and other state artifacts that adorn school spaces, and the centrality of white heteropatriarchy in curriculum and textbooks (Montgomery, 2005; Stanley, 2006). These disciplinary techniques regulate the practices of teachers and

students who embody and perform the notion of “good citizen.” This position of goodness and innocence is maintained as “proof of superiority” (St. Denis & Schick, 2003, p. 66), because to be marked as good is to be innocent of the domination of others (Razack, 1998).

Many educational scholars (Anyon, 2009; Banks, 2005; Boler, 1999; Cammarota, 2011; Carr & Klassen, 1997; Castagno, 2008; Dei, 1996; Haviland, 2008; Hytten & Warren, 2003; Kovach, 2013; Kumashiro, 2000; Leonardo, 2009; Marx, 2004; Schick, 2000; St. Denis, 2011; Wilson, 1996; 2013) believe that public schools are a key space to investigate the reproduction of whiteness, heteronormativity and other relations of power. Researchers have argued that social institutions such as schools are implicated in practices that privilege dominant groups while marginalizing those who have been produced as Other. This means that the role of schools in working against oppression involves both a critique of systemic inequality and a movement against its own complicity (Kumashiro, 2000). This requires pedagogy that interrogates the various processes of normalization. As Youdell (2006) states,

Taking a Foucauldian approach, the school can be seen as a disciplinary institution in which particular power/knowledges are inscribed and contested. These are not only related to those knowledges identified as being legitimate components of the school curriculum, but entail the multiple power/knowledges which are deployed throughout the school day by teachers and students. (p. 59)

There has been extensive research that focuses on education as a possible intervention in the reproduction of inequality from scholars in various theoretical fields. Educators and researchers often describe this research through terms such as feminism, critical race, queer, and anti-oppressive theory in order to clearly define the analytical framework they are using to understand

how inequality is reproduced and maintained (Adams, 2010; Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2009; Kumashiro, 2004; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; North, 2008; St. Denis & Schick, 2003; Wilson, 1996; 2013). This approach for educators and scholars engaged in social justice is also characterized by focusing attention on the processes and practices that create institutional and systemic oppressions, with the idea that within the classroom, pedagogy is a process (Gore, 1995).

What Kind of Education?

My inspiration for using integrative antiracist pedagogy in a high school program came from a graduate level course called The Theory and Practice of Antiracist Education, taught by my co-supervisor Dr. Verna St. Denis. The course examined the historical and political processes of racialization, with a particular focus on white supremacy and the ways in which it is entrenched in our social and educational institutions. I also took a similar version of the class with Dr. Carol Schick for my PhD course work in 2011.

In the fall of 2006, I began teaching an undergraduate course to pre-service teachers that was initially developed by Dr. St. Denis and Dr. Schick. In the article, *What makes anti-racist pedagogy difficult?: Three popular ideological assumptions*, St. Denis and Schick (2003) explain how their course explored the following:

the production of class, gender, sexuality, disability, and race as intersecting and interlocking identity formations,” as well as how “difference is denaturalized through a process of exploring how dominant identifications such as able-bodied, middle-class, and heterosexual achieve normative recognition in relation to the construction of outsider identities such as disabled, homosexual, working class, and Aboriginal peoples. (p. 59)

Through the articles, films, and discussion, this course examined how systems of dominance have been produced and maintained over time, and shifted how I came to understand and explain inequality. While it was a difficult process to study my complicity in systems of violence and domination, it was also evident to me that this was a powerful form of intervention.

As a form of social justice education, my pedagogy draws from integrative antiracist theories. This form of praxis theorizes race as a central organizing factor of colonialism, but suggests that it does not operate alone. Scholars such as Dei (1995), Ng (2003), Dhamoon (2009), and Wilson (1996; 2013) contend that racialization must be understood in relation to other social constructions such as sexuality and gender. While there are many facets of integrative antiracist theory and practice, this section will describe four of the main tenets that will be discussed in this research study, and explain why it is a necessary praxis for our educational context.

The first tenet of integrative antiracist education contends that our identities are constructed through discursive formations that position us in particular ways. Antiracist scholar Dei (1995) describes integrative antiracism as:

an understanding of how the relational aspects of social difference (race, class, gender and sexual orientation) become mediated in people's historical and everyday lived experiences . . . how racial, class, gender and sexual identities are implicated in ways of knowing and knowledge itself is crucial to the antiracism project for transformative learning and social change. (p. 14)

Integrative antiracist pedagogy places relations of power at the center of analysis; it focuses on teaching about identity-making practices that are produced through discourses, the differential

ways we are positioned by these discourses, and how these formations are reified in particular contexts.

A second tenet of integrative antiracist pedagogy is a focus on analyzing and disrupting white supremacy. As Dei (1996) contends; “Antiracism critiques the culture of whiteness, specifically ideas and practices that establish, promote, and perpetuate white hegemony over socially constructed non-white peoples” (p. 5). This kind of inquiry allows us to examine the ways in which identity is produced by power relations, and requires white settlers to understand white identity construction and position ourselves in systems of domination. As Leonardo (2009) suggests, white people must engage in an investigation of white supremacy to gain “a thorough historical understanding of ‘how they came to be’ in a position of power” (p. 176). The purpose of this pedagogy is to disrupt the notion that public schools and classrooms are rational and neutral spaces where interactions between teachers and students are presumed to be free from the influences of race and other constitutions (Carr & Klassen, 1997; Hytten & Warren, 2003; Raby, 2004). The grand narratives of multiculturalism and tolerance, so familiar to those of us who live in the Canadian state, are celebrated in all of our institutions, but schools and the disciplines in particular reify these discourses in multiple and consistent ways (Mackey, 2002; Ng, 2003).

The many discourses that construct educational institutions as impartial, similarly work to erase our colonial history of racialized segregation in Canada. For example, racialization was practiced through legislation which ensured white settler children access to public school systems, while simultaneously forcing Indigenous children into the residential school system. The impact of over 100 years of colonial segregation in Canadian school systems has been the

subject of research studies that serve as a significant illustration of how mass public education has been used as racializing projects which reproduce colonial structures of inequality (Thielen-Wilson, 2012).

A third tenet of integrative antiracism provides a critique of the notion that knowledge production can be objective or neutral. As Razack (1998) states,

We need to direct our efforts to the conditions of communication and knowledge production that prevail, calculating not only who can speak and how they are likely to be heard but also how we know what we know and the interest we protect through our knowing. (p. 10)

This research positions schools as historically rooted in colonial knowledge production which is socially constructed through power dynamics, and as such, examines how some knowledge is legitimated and celebrated by the dominant settler culture, while others are relegated to the margins or silenced (Ndimande, 2010; Parkes, Gore, & Ellsworth, 2010; Wilson, 1996; 2013; 2015). This allows us to further explore how our everyday common sense understandings and our subjectivities get produced and maintained.

In schools, the hidden curriculum is much more complex than simply investigating resources; it includes pedagogical practices, the teachers' positioning as authority figure, the regulation of student subjects, and particular kinds of knowledge production. As Gore (1995) suggests,

To explain the surprisingly limited and consistent range of practices, I speculated that the institution of schooling might produce its own 'regime of pedagogy', a set of power-

knowledge relations, of discourses and practices, which constrains the most radical of educational agendas. (p. 166)

The discursive practices which produce relations of power must be understood before they can be challenged. My pedagogical practices have developed from a belief that knowledge production (both learning and unlearning) can possibly create conditions for a new kind of subject that engages in disrupting systems of inequality, creating space for a more humanizing education (Leonardo, 2009).

A fourth tenet of integrative antiracism is the importance of learning through crisis. As Kumashiro (2000) notes, “Learning about oppression and unlearning one’s worldviews can be upsetting and paralyzing to students, and thus can lead them into what I call the ‘paradoxical position of learning and unlearning’” (p. 44). Leonardo (2009) notes that people who occupy positions of dominance will resist learning about their participation in reproducing relations of power. The emotions that often arose as my students and I worked through these processes included denial, anger, shame, and fear of change (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012). As Zembylas and Boler (2002) contend, “A pedagogy of discomfort entails creating spaces for epistemological and emotional problematizations of individual and collective emotions, histories, and sense of self” (np). Far from being purely intellectual, integrative antiracist pedagogies invite emotional responses that are part of the process of (un)learning.

The goal of integrative antiracist pedagogy is to move our class towards accountability, a process that requires us to acknowledge how we have come to think and perform in ways that normalize and reproduce hierarchies.

Tracing our complicity in these systems requires that we shed notions of mastering differences, and invest our energies in exploring the histories, social relations, and conditions that structure groups unequally in relation to one another and that shape what can be known, thought and said. (Razack, 1998, p. 10)

Teaching to transgress is a process that requires teachers and students to resist the desire to have definitive answers (hooks, 1994). As Kumashiro (2000) contends, “Disruptive knowledge is not an end in itself, but a means toward the always-shifting end/goal of learning more” (p. 34).

The work of theorists such as Foucault (1995) have provided critical race, queer, and feminist scholars with an analysis that reveals how power is reified beyond structural practices of reproduction, to include discursive processes as well. Foucault examines how the subject is constituted through historically situated discourses of “truth,” and how these truth regimes become naturalized, and therefore hegemonic. Foucault’s theory of subjectivation is significant in its analysis of how individuals are subjected to relations of power by being categorized and classified in institutions such as public schools. Teaching integrative antiracism can help students and teachers to understand how positionality is produced through discourses, in order to challenge them (Kumashiro, 2000).

AGC30 Program Curriculum and Practices

The AGC30 course that is the class context of this self-study is a locally developed curriculum initially written by two of my colleagues, and later revised by myself and a colleague who has also completed her MEd in antiracist education. The course goals include an expectation that, “Students will participate actively in the local community, realize the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and demonstrate a commitment to social justice” (Applied Global

Citizenship 30, 2007, p. 6). I first began teaching AGC30 in the fall of 2008 at a small high school in an urban center, then I was transferred 2 years later to a larger high school where I continued to teach the program until 2013. In the second year of the program, I co-taught the course with a colleague, and I have also had 3 interns co-teach the course with me at different times. The program was a half day for one semester (4 months), and included the integration of English Language Arts 30, History 30, and AGC 30, with students receiving 3 Grade 12 credits from the course.

The program focused on an investigation into the impact of white settler invasion on Indigenous Peoples and lands, as well as an exploration of identity-making practices that (re)produce markers of sexuality, gender, race, class, ability, and other constitutions. The course also provided a critical analysis of the nationalist discourses that construct Canada as a democratic, tolerant, multicultural nation which is pervasive in the reproduction of nation building. We integrated ecological justice issues, linking ongoing colonial practices such as resource extraction to the destruction of Indigenous lands and culture. The course situated these practices within a global context in order to link transnational systems of power with the ongoing exploitation of subjugated bodies, other species, and natural resources. Finally, our class examined the many places/spaces where people have resisted these systems of oppression by creating “practices of freedom” (hooks, 1994) through resurgence and self-determination.

The pedagogy students describe in this study draws from the following teaching methods: 1) inquiry projects 2) cooperative learning 3) portfolio assessment 4) critical resources. I will briefly touch on how we engaged each of these methods in the description of the course that follows. Far from being prescriptive, the description of the AGC30 course is useful in that it

provides a context for understanding the data that is analyzed throughout this research. As North (2007) suggests, “Poststructuralist scholars offer important critiques of anti-oppressive educational endeavors that attempt to realize prescriptive, predictable, totalizing goals” (p. 77). As it should be with any pedagogy, integrative antiracism is an organic and contextual process which is difficult to describe, however aside from the theories that are central to the course, the practices below were a crucial part of the program.

Inquiry Projects: Using the curriculum as a guide, the course materials centered critical analysis through investigations that took place both inside and outside of our classroom space. Students were encouraged to choose from a wide variety of topics to create projects that they would teach to the class. These projects were selected from themes such as “nation building practices,” “the Canadian identity,” “critical media studies,” “social movements” and negotiated on an individual and group basis, but included a) research on a specific topic and b) creating assignments that would be a teaching tool for the class. Students were encouraged to use multimedia sources such as handouts, PowerPoints, essays, videos or photographs to engage the class in their topic.

The course also focused on experiential learning; the applied aspect of the course required that our class experience various landscapes through trips to art galleries and museums, films and lectures, guest speakers, and community events both within and outside of our urban context. Students engaged in various levels of community organizing on issues of social and environmental justice such as coordinating conferences, teach-ins, rallies, concerts, and other school and community projects. I provided the theoretical lens that facilitated our learning, and students chose the issues they wanted to focus on and developed their own projects.

While our class studied solidarity work and coalition building in the course, we did not work directly with other groups. This was a conscious choice on my part given the short term 4 month/half day structure of the course, and the essential need to build trusting relationships between groups that had different social locations—particularly as students were just beginning to learn about relations of power. I agree with Bickford and Reynolds (2002) who contend that it is “simply ineffectual, and possibly unethical, to do a “hit-and-run” on a community or group of people” (p. 294) for the purposes of education.

Co-operative Learning: The course was structured around co-operative learning through group research into the historical and contemporary policies and practices that produce inequitable social relations. Students chose their own groups for various projects, but always had the option to work in pairs or alone. The classroom space was a relaxed atmosphere with round tables, couches, a TV, and student assignments, posters, and artwork on social and ecological justice issues covering the walls. This atmosphere invited the students to connect to the space and each other.

Portfolio Assessment: Students in AGC30 were required to submit a portfolio of their learning at mid-term and final for assessment, and were encouraged to be creative with their projects. Students were positioned as co-teachers/learners, intellectuals, scholars/authors, researchers and activists. We co-developed assignments that were dynamic and relevant to the students’ lives. Students were invited to create texts in the form of art, poetry, performance, film, and music as part of our goal to strengthen their communication and composition skills. We also developed an anthology of student work for each of us to keep at the end of the year.

The criteria for each project was co-constructed by the class and each project received

written/verbal assessment from me as well as peer assessment. I taught in a marks-based public school system, and as a result grades had to be submitted. Mid-term and final grades were determined through a process of ongoing feedback and student-teacher negotiation. Parents were formally invited for the mid-term and final student-teacher portfolio assessment, and our class had an open door policy where parents and community members were welcome to join us in our daily school work.

Critical Resources: Some of the resources we used came from the antiracist education graduate courses I studied with Dr. St. Denis and Dr. Schick. For example, students watched films that explored the construction of masculinity and femininity in mass media such as *Killing Us Softly 4* (2010) narrated by Jean Kilbourne and *Tough Guise* (1999) narrated by Jackson Katz. Our class also watched films that examined the construction of whiteness such as *Race: The Power of an Illusion* (2003), a three-part series showing the history of racial formation; *Edward Said on Orientalism* (1998) which details the production of discourses on Arabs and Muslims by western powers. We also analyzed films such as *Reel Injun: On the Trail of the Hollywood Indian* (2009) which explores the construction of Indigeneity in Hollywood films, and *Reel Bad Arabs* (2006) which examines the construction of Muslims in Hollywood films. These resources were helpful in denaturalizing essentialist constructions of gendered-sexual and racialized constitutions. We also watched numerous documentaries that examined social, political, and ecological issues—these are only a few examples of the many films we used in the course.

We analyzed several novels, short stories, essays, and articles that allowed us to discuss and analyze dominant narratives. For example, students read Lawrence Hill's (2007) *The Book of Negroes*, Thomas King's (2003) *The Truth About Stories: A Native Narrative*, and Sherman

Alexis' (2007) *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*. We also read the work of many other local writers and artists. It is important to note that students brought in critical resources as well, often in the form of multimedia such as comedians, music, spoken word poets, as well as resources they were troubled by such as newspaper clippings. In the end, problematic resources were also essential to this course as we analyzed them together—in fact practicing critical analysis as a class was an important aspect of our learning.

This section on the context of the course is a summary of some of the aspects that were foundational to the AGC30 program. These details provide a sense of structure to the course that is significant for understanding student interviews. The open and fluid organization of the course created as many tensions and pitfalls as there were powerful moments of learning. In spite of the goals of the course, as Kumashiro (2000) contends, “The teacher can never really know (1) whether the student learned what he or she was trying to teach, and (2) how the student will be moved by what was learned” (p. 38). Critical education does not necessarily lead to transformation and action, although that is the goal.

Outline of the Dissertation

Chapter 2) *Foucauldian Theory in Education*: This chapter will provide a summary of Foucault's (1995) theory of subjectivity and disciplinary power in relation to public schools and mass education. The notion of disciplinary power is a shift from structural analysis to panopticism, where individuals are constituted through discursive practices and self-regulation. Butler (1993, 1997) extends Foucault's analysis through her theory of performativity which is an act of self-constitution through repetitive performances of particular discourses. The theories of subjectivation and performativity suggest that while subjects are constituted through relations of

power, there are discursive spaces for transgressions.

Chapter 3) *Self-Study Research Methodology*: This chapter describes the factors that made self-study a significant methodological process for this research, and provides an account of how the student data was coded and analyzed using discourse analysis. This research draws from Wetherell and Potter's (1992) framework for discourse analysis, which requires that the research provide 1) a description of the history and social relations relevant to the area of investigation, 2) a systematic linguistic analysis of the patterns of discourse, and 3) the ability to connect the latter with the former. This framework allowed me to situate our discursive practices within a context of white settler colonialism and nation building practices.

Chapter 4) *Situating Myself in the Study*: This chapter will examine how my teaching identity shifted over the course of my career from discourses of white femininity and care, to antiracist heroism. Using memory work and excerpts from my writing, I will show how these self-constituting practices reify state narratives of benevolence, positioning me as both innocent and superior in a colonial context. I will suggest that solidarity work is one way to possibly disrupt these narratives.

Chapter 5) *Power relations in pedagogy: Regulating bodies; making docile subjects*: Drawing from Foucault's theory of schools as technologies of control, this chapter analyzes how disciplinary techniques used in public schools regulate students' bodies. Foucault (1995) suggests that the repetition of these practices in prisons, army barracks, and schools produce docile bodies that are ready for production—or the making of a new subject. This chapter analyzes excerpts from the data titled "Schooling and Learning" in order to examine how power relations are exercised in pedagogy.

Chapter 6) *Canadian Nationalism and Racial Formations*: This chapter will analyze students' descriptions of learning from the AGC30 in order to examine how whiteness is accomplished through the discursive practices of race and nationhood. The analysis from this chapter will suggest that the white students continued to perform whiteness as they described their learning in a course focused on integrative antiracism. In constituting themselves as both innocent and superior, students embody the discursive practices of the benevolent white settler state.

Chapter 7) *Queering Subjects*: Using student's excerpts of gender and sexuality from the context of the AGC30 course, this chapter examines the discourses that regulate heteronormativity in public schools. The examples of surveillance and self-surveillance described in this chapter can be understood as disciplinary techniques that reproduce white heteropatriarchy. The discursive practices that uphold and reproduce the Canadian state are reconstituted through the students' embodiment of nationalist narratives.

Chapter 8) *Practices of Empire*: This chapter will examine the data coded Activism and Social Justice, where students discussed the community projects they were engaged in during and after the AGC30 course. Drawing from Foucault's (1995) theory of subjectivity, I will analyze how students performed discourses of liberal individualism, white civility, and saviorism both during and after the course. In this chapter I will contend that nationalist discourses of "good citizenship" constrain the possibilities for activism in public school classrooms.

Chapter 9) *Conclusion*: This chapter will describe aspects of my learning during the research process and explain how I came to particular insights regarding the co-production of teacher/student identity through pedagogy. I will also summarize some of the key findings from

the data and provide further research that points to the significance of integrative antiracist pedagogy.

Chapter 2: Power Relations in Pedagogy

The student, teacher and school are each subjected to the gaze of the next, and all of them are subject to the gaze of the state. (Youdell, 2006b, p. 36)

Introduction

In the introductory chapter, I refer to a body of scholarship which has provided ongoing critical analysis of prevailing notions that public schools are neutral spaces. The assertion that schooling may reproduce particular relations of power will be explored further in this chapter through the Foucauldian framework that underpins this study. I draw from Foucault's primary work in this study, in particular focusing on his theories of schooling and subjectivity in *Discipline and Punish: Birth of the Prisons* (1995). I also use various interpretations and analysis of Foucauldian theories such as Baker and Heyning (2004), Butler (1990, 1993, 1997), Gore (1995), Prado (2000), Rabinow and Rose (1994), St. Pierre (2000, 2004), Stoler (1995), and Youdell (2006a, 2006b, 2010). Drawing from Foucauldian theories of subjectivation, this study contends that individuals and institutions cannot exist outside of power relations.

Foucault offers a reformulation of power that alters the way in which the subject is understood. For example, in educational sociology and the social sciences, power has been conceptualized as something that is possessed and exerted by a state, group, or individual. The prevailing understanding that power is held by a monarch, institution, or social group has been characterized as sovereign power by Foucault (1995). Foucault (1995) shifts away from the idea of sovereign power, which is understood to be held and exercised over others, to the notion of disciplinary power which is productive and formative. The notion of disciplinary power is a shift from structural analysis to panopticism, where individuals are constituted through discursive

practices and self-regulation.

Foucault's theory of subjectivation draws from the work of his teacher Althusser (1971), who argued that ideologies and discourses are productive of social subjects. Althusser's (1971) analysis in *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses* contends that individuals are already subjects, as ideologies determine subjectivity before one is even born. Subjects are constructed as they are recruited uncritically by dominant state ideologies, which means we are "called to" or take up certain subject positions that are already available in discursive formations. This means that agency is limited to the discursive formations that are available in any culture. Althusser (1971) argues that the interpellation of individuals as subjects is a structural feature of all ideology, as it "recruits" or transforms the individual into subjects. While this process relies on a structure of recognition, Althusser (1971) also argues that rather than seeing discursive practices as external, there is also a process of misrecognition where people claim to be authors of their own thoughts and actions.

In contrast, Foucault contends that a focus on ideology implies that there is the possibility of a non-ideological or objective gaze towards history where one can discern "the truth" of what has actually occurred. Foucault sees knowledge as constituted through discursive formations, which means that there is no neutral platform outside of discourse or the formation of power/knowledge. Foucault is interested in studying patterns of domination however he does not focus on the purpose or intention but rather on the shape of 'meticulous rituals of power'" (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 81). Discourses and practices are not seen as representing a particular group or their interests, but have a dynamic of their own that becomes the target of study. Foucault investigates how agents, objects, and subjects are the effects of relations of

power.

At the center of the theoretical framing for this study is the assertion that human subjects are not autonomous, unified self-determining individuals separate from the discourses and practices which socialize us. Instead, subjects are constituted within available discourses and take up positions in different ways. Foucault (1995) argues that there is no space outside of discourse where subjects can reside independently of the processes which mark them in particular ways. However, any social site, such as the public school classroom, will have multiple discourses that position subjects in different and sometimes contradictory ways, producing subjectivities that are fragmented. The value of drawing from Foucault's analysis in educational research is clear; it offers new insights into our understanding of how inequalities are discursively reproduced in schools, and provides a space for us to think about how subjects which appear to be fixed, might possibly be reconsidered.

The theoretical framework for this research study is organized in this chapter in the following sequence; *Part I: Power/knowledge and humanism in education* will focus on the context of humanism in education and how Foucault's theory of power/knowledge interrogates essentialism within humanist discourse. *Part II: Schools as disciplinary practices* investigates schools as disciplinary practices that are both productive and an effect of discourse, focusing on three of the following aspects from Foucault's theory of subjectivation: i) The five disciplinary techniques used in institutions such as schools to regulate bodies, ii) The tactics used in the pedagogy of subject making that produce docile bodies, iii) The notion of performativity and agency in subject formation, and Butler's ongoing engagement with Foucauldian theory. Foucault's theory of subjectivation allow us to analyze a site such as a public school classroom

in order to examine how discursive practices make certain things possible or more likely, while limiting others.

Part I: Power/Knowledge and Humanism in Education

Within our colonial context in Canada, the ideologies of humanism continue to permeate our institutions, in particular our public education systems. As St. Pierre suggests, “The language, practice and effects” of humanism have become naturalized and “overwhelming in its totality” (2000, p. 478). The tenets of humanism regarding knowledge, truth, and rationality construct differences as innate or essentialized, rather than produced through relations of power. Most noteworthy, humanism contends that there is a stable, sovereign, coherent self which is a product of natural or biological forces. Within the traditions of education, humanism has constructed knowledge which reproduces ideologies of individualism, reifying structures based on binaries and orderly schemes. This section will discuss how Foucault’s genealogy challenges essentialist notions and provides an alternative lens for understanding subject formation.

Foucauldian theory has been a response to the construction of “truths” within humanism which contend that patriarchy, racism, homophobia, ableism, and other systemic oppressions are naturally occurring (St. Pierre, 2000). Foucault (1994a) explains that;

humanism . . . is a theme, or rather, a set of themes that have reappeared on several occasions, over time, in European societies; these themes, always tied to value judgments, have obviously varied greatly in their content, as well as in the values they have preserved. (p. 44)

Some of these themes include the positivist ideology that objective knowledge can be acquired through reason in the sciences, philosophy, history, and other academic disciplines. These

ideologies mark the project of knowledge production, schooling, and teaching as neutral and objective in the production of knowledge.

Foucault (1994a) contends that the foundations of humanism have produced knowledge on various disciplines such as the sciences of health and illness, reproductive technologies, eugenics and race. In particular, colonial governments sought to manage populations constructed as ‘different’ in terms of racialized, gendered, and sexual identities. Foucault’s term biopower, names and groups together the process of marking and managing groups of people constructed as naturally, biologically, racially or ethnically distinct (Foucault, 1970). Reframing these disciplinary techniques in the context of biopower, allows us to understand how subjects are constructed and governed through discourse in order to serve specific political objectives (Rabinow & Rose, 1994).

Foucault uses both archeology and genealogy to analyze the historical concepts within humanism in order to make a compelling case regarding how discursive structures come to be considered the truth. For example, archeology begins by providing an alternative account to taken for granted discourses and rendering problematic what is least questioned and seems obvious and natural within a discipline or institution. Foucault argues that this type of inquiry is an important exercise because it is not that people act blindly, without thought, or act without intention, but that, “People know what they do; they frequently know why they do what they do; but what they don’t know is what what they do does” (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983, p. 187). Foucault’s archeological analysis of discourse is important because he not only interrogates discourses in the present, but also charts the development of certain discursive practices so we can see that in spite of their familiarity, they are also arbitrary discourses that can change, and

that the origins of these discourses can be traced to key shifts in history (Mills, 1997).

Foucault focuses on the relationship between constructions of truth, knowledge, and power, contending that the study of history is an attempt to capture the origins or the essential beginnings of something through reasoned inquiry. Drawing on German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche's work, Foucault (1994b) argues that genealogy is the alternative to history, in that it does not seek a linear continuity back in time. Instead, genealogy unearths a series of practices and ideologies that may be unrelated, multiple, and complex yet coincide in a way that can appear to be essentialist. Foucault uses genealogical inquiry to examine how discourses of mental illness in *Madness and Civilization: a history of insanity in the age of reason* (1965), punishment in *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (1995), and sexuality in *The history of sexuality: An introduction* (1990) have been historically produced.

Foucault (1995) uses the term "government" to designate the disciplinary management of people and the ways technologies structure and limit modes of action. One of the most important ways in which governmentality operates is through the construction of knowledge and disciplines which produce "experts," such as teachers, who evaluate and determine who we are and how we should act. For Foucault, a "discipline is both a field of study and a system of control" where truth claims constitute a learned practice that also shapes our behavior (Prado, 2000, p. 25). Disciplines have traditionally been viewed as objective topics of study, however Foucault argues that power perpetually creates knowledge and knowledge enables and sustains power relations. In *Power/Knowledge* (1980), Foucault states; "It is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge, it is impossible for knowledge to not engender power" (p. 52).

While a discipline such as history focuses on obtaining "objective knowledge,"

genealogy, or what Nietzsche termed effective history, acknowledges that history is temporally and culturally situated (Foucault, 1994b). In this way, historical grand narratives which are taken for granted regimes of truth are questioned and disrupted. Foucault contends that history becomes an exercise where the genealogist begins an analysis by posing a question in the present (Foucault, 1994b). Foucault's use of genealogy shows how individuals, practices and institutions are located within a wider spectrum of relations of knowledge, power, and subjectivities.

Within the colonial state, the public school system becomes a site where specific power/knowledge is reproduced through mass education, with the advent of indistinguishable educational technologies that are used across North America, and in many cases globally. Foucault argues, however, that in spite of the initial intention, an apparatus such as a school will respond to problems in ways that may have diverse and unplanned effects (Foucault, 1994b).

As a disciplinary system, education is an integral and vital part of power/knowledge production which reproduces particular discourses. In Foucault's genealogies, for example, the disciplinary techniques which produce particular power/knowledge include discourses which are constructed as "truth," as well as administering silence. For example, in the *History of Sexuality*, Foucault (1990) lays out how the study of sexuality can produce particular subjectivities that are legitimated through the human sciences and established as the truth. This demonstrates how power "manufactures a particular subjectivity that is internalized and made the truth about oneself by most members of our culture" (Prado, 2000, p. 85). While there are various discourses which reify colonial logics, this study will focus on the dominant discourses which constitute Canadian-ness in particular ways.

Drawing from Foucault's theory of subjection allows me to examine the relationship between particular discourses and subject positions within a specific context. Foucault's theory of subjectivation investigates the links between the individual and the social by centering discourse as productive of human thought and experiences. Foucault analyzes the formation of discourse in order to examine relations of power. The definition of discourse has many meanings and can be used in a range of different ways. As Foucault (1989) states;

Instead of gradually reducing the rather fluctuating meaning of the word 'discourse', I believe I have in fact added to its meanings: treating it sometimes as the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements. (p. 90)

Foucault's first definition of discourses as a "general domain of all statements," refers more broadly to general speech and texts that have meaning and effect on the world. The second and third definitions regarding the "individualizable group of statements," and "regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements" are more concerned with groups of statements that are regulated by rules and structures (Mills, 1997). More specifically, Foucault (1989) suggests that we can no longer treat "discourses as groups of signs (signifying elements referring to contents or representations) but as practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (p. 54). These discursive practices can be understood as regulating and normalizing particular ways for subjects to think and perform.

Foucault (1981) contends that subjectivities are produced through discourse, however individuals are not only constituted in discourse, but are also constitutive of discourse. In this way, discourses are performative and therefore are considered a form of social action. This

research also draws from Judith Butler's ongoing engagement with Foucault (1990, 1993, 1997) by investigating the possibilities of Butler's (1997) politics of performative resignification. Analyzing how the "self" might be formed discursively can impact the way teachers and students think about and perform our subjectivity. Foucauldian theory allows us to examine the complexities of subject formation that reproduce particular power relations in a public school setting (Youdell, 2006b).

Educational scholars such as Fischer (2009), contend that Foucault's theory of discourse, power, and subjectivity is important for research in education because it allows for an investigation of power in smaller, localized struggles—such as in daily school practices. She contends that rather than see power as repressive, Foucault urges us to think about power as productive, a power that establishes discourses and practices as well as resistance to these practices. Foucault's theories on power and subjectivation are helpful in analyzing how subjects are regulated and governed in public schools. This means interrogating disciplinary techniques in classroom practices that shape subjectivity and establish regimes of truth (Prado, 2000).

Part II: Schools as Disciplinary Practices

Foucault maintains that people who were once controlled by a sovereign entity, such as a monarch, have become subjects controlled by an authority which marks, labels, and regulates human thought and behavior. In Part II I will focus on Foucault's contention that the techniques of control employed by the penal system in *Discipline and Punish* (1995) offer a case study for understanding the production of contemporary norms that govern individuals in institutions such as schools. This analysis will provide examples of how disciplinary techniques in schools are concerned with spatial distributions of enclosure and partitioning such as the structure of schools,

classrooms, and row of desks. Disciplinary techniques are also used to regulate bodies through exhaustive use of timetabling, ranking, and classification of bodies; compartmentalization of subjects and constant repetition of daily tasks. Foucault's theory of "Normalizing judgment" occurs when teachers compare, categorize, and correct behaviors, producing particular subjects. Hierarchical observation or surveillance underpin these technologies as "the student, teacher and school are each subjected to the gaze of the next, and all of them are subject to the gaze of the state" (Youdell, 2006b, p. 36).

Foucault argues that what he calls disciplines or managerial techniques were developed into a technology for managing and controlling people. The new techniques do not inflict pain on the body, but rather manage it through "schedules, restrictions, and constant assessments and examinations" which reproduce habits and value-laden self-images (Foucault, 1995, p. 203). Foucault (1995) argues that disciplinary systems were not developed to redress wrongs committed, but rather to increase subjugation and control. Foucault provides many examples of how these techniques proved so effective as mechanisms of control that they were replicated in institutions that involve large numbers of people such as army barracks, hospitals, factories, and schools (Foucault, 1995). The use of disciplinary controls also marked a shift in how people were not only physically constrained but also considered internally malleable. Foucault calls this the political technology of the body because the aim is not mere control, which can be achieved through restrictions and laws, but constant and pervasive surveillance and management (Foucault, 1995). This management is achieved through definitions and descriptions that construct behavior governing norms, producing an internalized value-laden understanding of the self. Individuals are then complicit in this process and seek to conform.

For Foucault, subjectivity is not a given, which is why he focuses on how the body becomes the marker for the illusion of a unified subject. The body bears the developing subjectivity that is the effect of regulating discourse in its habits, gestures, and speech (Prado, 2000). In this way, Foucault (1994b) does not reveal the nature of the self, but works to expose how “the body is the surface of the inscription of events” (p. 356) marked by historical discourses and practices. Particularly in terms of his use of genealogy, Foucault created a compelling history of how different technologies in our culture produce subjects. In fact, in *Discipline and Punish* (1995) Foucault goes into great detail in describing the architecture of schools and other institutions to examine the disciplinary devices that focus on management and surveillance of the body. This study will focus on how this process is reified in the daily practices of teachers and students in public school classrooms.

In *Discipline and Punish* (1995), Foucault contends that disciplinary systems are created to manipulate and control what was constructed as deviant behavior, which had the corollary effect of co-constructing “normal” behavior. Disciplinary punishment became corrective, working to normalize the subject. One of the many results of this system and other disciplinary systems like it was to “create notions and judges of normality” in our institutions; the doctor, the administrator, and the teacher all become judges that are assumed to have the moral authority to impose and control human behavior (Foucault, 1995, p. 199).

Disciplinary Techniques

The process of subjectivation refers from the discursive practices which produce people as social subjects and subjects them to relations of power. In *Discipline and Punish* (1995) Foucault offers five devices that were used in the development of institutions such as schools

that dealt with the discipline of mass populations. These are: 1) hierarchal observation, 2) normalizing judgment, 3) the examination, 4) panopticism, and 5) surveillance (p. 170). Each of these devices are regulating techniques that construct normativity, but also individualize difference by making it possible to measure variations and gaps from an imposed value system. Foucault (1995) maintains that hierarchal observation involves structuring institutions so that individuals positioned as having greater authority, such as school administrators and principals, have responsibility and oversee those marked with less authority. Normalizing judgment is maintained through the use of constructions of “normality” which assesses and compare individuals to the preferred construction. This assessment then marks the individuals in particular ways. The examination, like normalizing judgment, uses constructions of normality to assess individuals, but also has the authority of testing, which legitimizes constructed knowledges about an individual’s intelligence or capacity.

The idea of the panopticon is taken from Bentham’s idea of an ideal prison (Foucault, 1995) which includes a cylinder building in which the prisoners are isolated from each other and in constant view from the guards’ watch tower. Prisoners are watched continually but do not know when they are being observed which creates an atmosphere of constant surveillance. Foucault (1995) compares the technique of the panopticon to classroom structures where the teacher can view students from the front of the classroom, and students are isolated from each other by desks situated in rows. The final device is surveillance, which is the actual observation. Foucault (1995) discusses how disciplinary techniques require that individuals are constantly aware of an administrator or figure of authority such as a teacher, and this gaze constitutes self-surveillance. To be effective, Foucault suggests that observation and disciplinary techniques

require the enclosure of large groups gathered in a specific place, such as a classroom, for significant periods of time (Foucault, 1995).

These five devices provide the repetition of disciplinary routines which modify conduct and produce subjects that effectively discipline themselves through self-surveillance. According to Foucault (1995), there was little concern for how individuals responded to the process as long as the end result is conformity. Foucault contends that while the original intent may have been to implement an enlightened system which produces more responsible citizens, what educational institutions effectively provided are techniques for social control. Foucault (1995) argues that, much like other disciplinary systems, schooling is,

an institution of the “mutual” type in which three procedures are integrative into a single mechanism: teaching proper, the acquisition of knowledge by the very practice of the pedagogical activity and a reciprocal, hierarchized observation. A relation of surveillance, defined and regulated, is inscribed at the heart of the practice of teaching, not as an additional or adjacent part, but as a mechanism that is inherent to it and increases its efficiency. (p. 176)

In order to understand how this process works, Foucault analyzes a number of practices in schools which regulate the bodies of students.

The Pedagogy of Subject Making

Foucault (1995) states that the disciplines were policies of coercion that acted upon the body in order to manipulate and control its gestures and behavior, producing subjected and practiced bodies which he calls “docile bodies” (p. 138). Various techniques were used over time so that bodies could be broken down and reconfigured, producing passive subjects that

operate in particular ways. Foucault (1995) contends that these disciplinary techniques were “gradually imposed on pedagogical practices” (p. 159), where teaching practices were formed that were meticulous in detail, breaking down the subject being taught into its simplest elements and hierarchizing each stage of development into particular stages.

In *Discipline and Punish* (1995), Foucault creates a detailed account of the techniques employed in educational institutions in order to regulate behavior such as controlling the uses of space. For example, he argues that disciplines require the distribution of bodies in space, which means large populations are enclosed in a specific place heterogeneous to all others, such as public school classrooms. Foucault also contends that the enclosed space must allow for partitioning so that “each individual has its own place and each place its individual” (p. 143), such as the function of desks that partition students from each other into rows. The disciplines also require a functional site; for example, in a school setting teachers can walk up and down the aisle of a classroom, carrying out supervision that would observe both individual and group behavior and performance in order to watch over students and also compare them to each other. As Foucault (1995) suggests, each pupil has a place assigned to them, and none of them are allowed to leave or change it “except on the order or with the consent of the school inspector” (p. 147), giving the teacher complete authority over the bodies of students. Finally, Foucault (1995) contends that the disciplines are an art of ranking a technique for the transformation of behavior, stating that;

In the eighteenth century, “rank” begins to define the great form of distribution of individuals in the educational order . . . rank attributed to each pupil at the end of each task and each examination; the rank he obtains week to week, month to month, year to

year; an alignment of age groups, one after another, a succession of subjects taught and questions treated, according to an order of increasing difficulty. (p. 147)

This made the educational space function like a learning machine for supervision, hierarchizing, and rewarding behavior that was deemed appropriate. Foucault (1995) contends that school spaces provide fixed positions as they carve out “individual segments,” “mark places,” and “indicate values,” guaranteeing the “obedience of individuals” (p. 148).

Foucault (1995) also argues that control is regulated through various techniques such as the organization of a series of acts and the regulation of time. For example, a time-table was used in order to establish rhythms, regulate the cycle of repetition and impose particular gestures; “In the elementary schools, the division of time became increasingly minute; activities were governed in detail by orders that had to be obeyed immediately” (p. 150). In this way, various techniques are used to control students using specific repetitive tasks that regulate the body, as Foucault (1995) suggests,

A well disciplined body forms the operational context of the slightest gesture. Good handwriting, for example, presupposes a gymnastics—a whole routine whose rigorous code invests the body in its entirety, from the points of the feet to the tip of the index finger. (p. 152)

This technique requires a dependency on the master as the student’s body is led through a number of tasks which are temporally regulated (dividing duration of tasks into successive or parallel segments) and which must end at a specific time and with an examination.

The seriation of successive school activities produces the possibility for detailed control by the teacher through regular interventions of “differentiation, correction, punishment, and

elimination” (p. 160). Foucault calls the repetition of these techniques exercises and suggests that these mechanisms of control were deemed a progressive and necessary aspect of developmental education. The ideal of an educational program which would follow a child to the end of their schooling and would involve increasing complexity was believed to ensure a gradual acquisition of knowledge and good behavior. Foucault (1995) argues that it is the combination of these practices—the distribution and surveillance of bodies, the temporal seriation and coding of activities, and the evaluative mechanism that produced norms—which creates the highest form of disciplinary practice called tactics. Tactics were developed and used effectively to produce particular subjects in institutions such as prison systems, military bases, and schools. The object being made—the body of the student—is marked by colonial discourses and relations of power. As Foucault suggests, “In becoming the target for new mechanisms of power, the body is offered up to new forms of knowledge” (p. 155).

Agency and Performativity

Foucault maintains that these disciplinary technologies mark a shift in society from the use of overt power to power relations constructed through discourse and practice. As Prado (2000) suggests: “The new conception of the subject has two separate aspects. The first is that an individual is a subject in the sense of being subject to regulations by other individuals, institutions, and the state. The second aspect is that an individual is a subject in the sense of experiencing subjectivity, of being aware” (p. 56). This experience of subjectivity includes goals, desires, and a sense of who one is, blurring the lines between a subject that is governed by social norms and a self-aware entity. Foucault sought to show that the self is a manufactured construct, a product of discourse produced by techniques rather than exhibiting “natural” or

essential traits and behaviors.

It is important to note that discursive relations of power are not deterministic, but are fluid and unpredictable. This is significant in thinking about educational praxis and social change. Foucauldian theories of discourse allow us to understand how subjects are produced through language and cultural practices as well as how they might be reconfigured. As Judith Butler (1993) contends, foundational structures are contingent, not absolute and therefore open to shifts and changes, which offers the possibility for reconstruction. Foucault's work has been significant in its analysis of how individuals are subjected to relations of power by being individualized, categorized, classified, surveilled, and impelled to self-surveillance (Foucault, 1995). Foucault argues that while the self is constituted discursively and subject to disciplinary power, self-conscious practices of a subject can potentially be practices of liberation.

Butler (1993) also explores the notion of performativity which she defines as "that discursive practice that enacts or produces that which it names" (p. 13). This suggests that discursive practices which appear to describe subjects are not descriptive, but rather productive. Butler (1993, 1997) offers an understanding of performatively constituted subjects by contending that in order to be intelligible, discursive practices must cite prior discursive practices. Butler suggests that the agency of this interpellated subject is enabled and constrained through discourse, so that any form of agency is not of a sovereign subject who exerts their will, but rather is an effect of discursive power (Butler, 1993). In other words, individuals that have access to alternative discourses may come to understand and perform their subjectivity in new ways. The possibilities for such disruptions are never guaranteed, however, due to the historicity of discursive practices.

Butler (1990, 1993) uses Foucault's notion of subjectivation to explore the performative where the constitution of the subject is created through a repetition of performances. The idea of the performative is taken from linguistics, where a word or phrase has the potential to create the thing that it states (St. Pierre, 2000). In thinking about how performatives make people, Butler turns to classification systems and categories that are used to name people, arguing that a body that is not marked and named cannot be made sense of or is unintelligible. Butler (1997) suggests that:

If a performative provisionally succeeds . . . that action echoes prior actions, and accumulates the force of authority through the repetition or citation of a prior and authoritative set of practices. It is not simply that the speech act takes place within a practice, but that the act itself is a ritualized practice. What this means then, is that a performative "works" to the extent that it draws on and covers over the constitutive conventions by which it is mobilized. In this sense, no term or statement can function performatively without the accumulating and dissimulating historicity of force. (p. 51)

Butler first developed these ideas in relation to gender, suggesting that terms such as "boy" and "girl" or "man" and "woman" are not simply descriptive but also performative. In other words, they create gendered subjects by appearing to simply describe them. Extending this to other identity constructions such as race and designations such as white or black are not biological racial descriptions, but are part of an ongoing historical process that creates discursively constituted categories which people are born in to (Gillborn & Youdell, 2000). This means that race and ethnic positions cannot be taken up by choice; in order for a performative to be intelligible, it must cite discourses regarding race and ethnicity that are already recognizable.

This recognition has been produced through historical discourses of science classification systems which construct characteristics of gender, race, and ethnicity as biological and innate.

Butler (1997) contends that the process of subjection requires a historical context and community of speakers where the recognition of the subject can take place, stating that this may be cited in various ways including the spoken word, textual and bodily representations, and also through silencing and erasure. As Gillborn and Youdell (2000) suggest, “Maintaining the notion of subjectivation when thinking about performative processes underscores the conceptual claim that performatives, and the subjects they constitute, are not neutral, but are invested in enduring relations of discursive, productive power” (p. 181).

If subjects are constituted through ongoing performative reiterations, this suggests that this process can be disrupted and subjects can be reconstituted differently. Butler (1993) argues that the performative is an opening to resist normative meanings, with the possibility of reinscription. Youdell (2010) provides us with contemporary examples of reinscription: “Gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender politics’ reinscription of ‘queer’; disability studies’ reinscription of ‘crip’; and hip hop’s reinscription of ‘nigga’ might all be understood as examples of such performative politics in action” (p. 325). In this way, subjectivity is constituted through multiple citations, but can also be disrupted or transgressed. Butler argues that any transgressions which occur can possibly impact identity formation. This is important for thinking about interventions in the (re)production of relations of power in public education.

Conclusion

Foucault’s theory of subjectivation can further our analysis of schools as technologies of control where knowledge production shapes the kinds of student subjects that are made in

schools. Disciplinary techniques are not deterministic, as power circulates through discursive practices in complex and sometimes contradictory ways. Foucault's (1995) notion of panopticism is a technology that exercises power through self-surveillance and self-regulation. Foucault argues that normativity is produced through particular discourses that we conform to by regulating ourselves based on societal values and classification systems.

Foucauldian theories of power have important implications for thinking critically about the production of subjects and the processes through which colonial discourses are reproduced and maintained in educational institutions. The constitution of particular subjects within discursive relations of power continue to have dire material consequences, as marginalized subjects are dehumanized and produced as objects.

Chapter 3: Self-Study Research Methodology

There is no escaping from power, that it is always-already present constituting that very thing which one attempts to counter it with. (Foucault, 1990, p. 82)

Introduction

This research combines self-study methodology with a Foucauldian analysis in order to investigate the relationship between nationalist discourses, teacher/student subjectivity, and the teaching and learning of integrative antiracism. Self-study research is aptly positioned to contribute to this study as it is a methodology used to investigate the connection between teacher identity, beliefs and praxis; it is the study of our pedagogy *in relation* to our students' learning. The term self-study can be confusing as many associate it with the study of the self, however the purpose of the word "self" in the label of self-study research is an assertion that the self—who is enacting a practice with others—is *the one doing the study and is in practice* (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). The various approaches to self-study originate from a fundamental concept: we learn from experience, however those experiences are also constructed by our socialization and positioning within a wider context. Drawing from experience requires reflection on what we describe as stories, or artefacts of practice, which become texts to be analyzed. The result is knowledge that supports teachers in continuing to think and perform differently (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2004).

Research centered on self-study has clear connections to Foucauldian theories of subject formation and the tenets of integrative antiracist education as they both contend that we cannot assume clear divisions between the individual and the social, suggesting there is a relationship between ideologies, discourses, and practices in classrooms and schools. Self-study

methodology allows teachers to examine our own ideologies and practices as the main problem for investigation (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2004). Self-study's investigation into the construction of knowledge, the use of inquiry into the subject position of the researcher, along with its emancipatory goals have important implications for linking self-study research with Foucauldian theory and integrative antiracist pedagogy.

In this chapter I will briefly explore the tensions between self-study and Foucauldian theory of subjectivation, the history of self-study and how it differs from other qualitative research methodologies, some of the factors which have influenced self-study scholarship, and why it can be a significant methodology for teachers engaged in social justice education. I will also outline the methods I used to gather data in the form of student interviews, highlighting some of the major themes that were the focus of this study. Finally, drawing from Wetherell and Potter (1992) I will discuss how I used discourse analysis to analyze the data.

Troubling “the Self” in Self-Study

This research study draws from Foucauldian theory in order to problematize some of the underlying principles of humanism such as the notion of identity as whole and coherent, language as descriptive rather than productive, and the rationality and objectivity of knowledge production. A significant amount of educational theory and research draws predominantly from humanist discourses and this includes the body of scholarship referred to as self-study (Sandretto, 2009; St. Pierre, 2000). The term self-study implies that there is a stable self that can be represented in research which creates potential contradictions with Foucauldian theories.

Self-study scholarship provides analysis of teaching experiences and centers teacher voice to investigate pedagogical practices. In his research on the theoretical underpinnings of

self-study, for example, LaBoskey (2004) suggests that “when we speak of the authentic self, we mean the whole self” (p. 829) implying there is a core unified subject which can be understood through research. The notion of teacher/student experiences as representative of reality is disrupted by Foucauldian theories. Self-study research is centered on “the authority of experience” which becomes “a privileged source of knowledge” (Sandretto, 2009, p. 94). While it is crucial to position ourselves within research, our positionality is not understood in this study through the concept of a stable subject, but rather informed by the social and political discourses that produce subjectivity. Sandretto (2009) contends however that a self-study research method “rarely unpacks how the self is conceptualized” (p. 91), and suggests that a Foucauldian critique can support a more complex reading of research into the connections between teacher/student identity and pedagogy.

This self-study research is an attempt to decenter the notion of a unified subject and denaturalize some of the discursive practices which reproduce dominance and oppression in schools. It may be impossible not to default to humanist discourses as St. Pierre (2000) suggests, “poststructuralism cannot escape humanism since it must always be implicated in the problem it addresses” (p. 479), however this research study seeks to disrupt essentialism where possible. It is important to note the tensions that Foucauldian theory creates for self-study as these tensions open a space for new possibilities in self-study research. As Sandretto (2009) suggests, “I am proposing that teacher educators might continue to work within the humanist discourses of education and at the same time commit themselves to trouble them by making use of various theoretical tools to (re)view them” (p. 93).

Historical Roots of Self-Study

In spite of the recent emergence of self-study, Clarke and Erickson (2004) suggest that teacher inquiry has always been an essential aspect of teaching. Many forms of practitioner inquiry have been influenced by scholars such as Antonio Gramsci, Paulo Freire, Maxine Green and bell hooks, all of whom worked towards transformative education. The focus on experiential research was furthered by Schön's (1983) work in the *Reflective Practitioner* (Loughran, 2004). In his research, Schön critiqued the focus in education toward technical rationality by disrupting the teaching narrative of theory-into-practice and recognizing that professional knowledge is mostly tacit and unexamined.

In formalizing the scholarship of self-study in North America, a group of like-minded scholars came together for a symposium in Arizona in 1992 titled "Holding up the Mirror: Teacher Educators Researching on their own Teaching." The scholars who presented papers; Guilfoyle (1992), Hamilton (1992), Pinnegar (1992), and Placier (1992) became collectively known as the Arizona Group. This group of emerging academics openly questioned the nature of the way they conducted their own teaching and wanted to know if and how their teaching made a difference for their students' learning (Loughran, 2004).

Self-study scholarship led a renewed focus on the complexities of teaching and learning and became a catalyst for re-examining the significance of researching teaching practices (Loughran, 2004). These trends also led to a growing commitment amongst teacher educators to engage in this type of research in a more systematic way. By 1994 Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP) was a fully functioning AERA (American Educational Researchers Association) SIG (Special Interest Group) and self-study appeared for the first time

in the AERA conference index (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). This categorization helped to legitimize self-study in the academy, and made it more recognizable and accessible to other scholars in education. A Canadian equivalent of the S-STEP SIG was founded in 2005 (Pinnegar & Hamilton).

The growth of self-study research in education resulted in influential bodies of work which provide the theoretical and foundational models for current approaches to self-study. As a result, self-study has contributed important aspects for our understanding of pedagogical practices. Publications such as *The International Handbook of Self-study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices* (Loughran, Hamilton, LaBoskey, & Russell, 2004) is one example of the significance of the emerging field of self-study for educators. As one of the more recent paradigms of practitioner inquiry, self-study scholars are creating a range of methodologies and taking on more complex issues than ever before (Pithouse, Mitchell, & Weber, 2009).

Many self-study scholars have worked to contextualize self-study by establishing broad boundaries for determining what is and what is not self-study. For example, Loughran (2004) identifies the following five features of self-study research: 1) Self-study defines the focus of study but not the way the study is carried out; 2) Self-study seeks alternative perspectives which is understood to capture a range of relationships from collaborative working relationships among colleagues to student experiences of learning; 3) Self-study scholarship listens to students and is in relation to feedback from students and/or colleagues; 4) Self-study is rife with tensions, dilemmas, and disappointments when the ideal image of our teaching comes in contrast with student experiences of learning; 5) Self-study researchers recognize the importance of audience in shaping how the data is reported.

Bullough and Pinnegar (2004) suggest that a decisive definition may be neither useful nor helpful for self-study scholarship. Loughran (2004) notes that self-study originated in the recognition that teachers stand simultaneously between two worlds: the world of practice and the world of research on education. The central claim of self-study researchers is to understand teaching from the inside out rather than outside in, placing what we learn from the research process into our practice. As Pinnegar (1998) states,

although participant observation, ethnographic, grounded theory, or statistical methods might be used in any single study, self-study involves a different philosophical and political stance. Researchers who embrace self-study through the simple act of choosing to study their own practice, present an alternative representation of the relationship of the researcher and the researched . . . as they explore the development of understanding in a practice context. (pp. 31–32)

This means that within the field of self-study research, there are a wide range of methods being employed, as well as numerous reporting styles. It is important to note that Loughran (2004), a pioneer and leading scholar of self-study, argues that while the S-STEP SIG has played a significant role in formalizing self-study as a methodology in teacher education, educators should not interpret this influence as limiting self-study to teacher educators or teaching education practices alone.

Self-Study and Related Qualitative Methodologies

Research in education over the last 2 decades has centered on the examination of pedagogy from the perspective of teachers using methodologies such as reflective practice, action research, teacher narratives, memory work, autobiography, and self-study (Bullough &

Pinnegar, 2004; LaBoskey, 2004; Loughran, 2004a). While there is a great deal of overlap in the assumptions of these various areas, including the valuing of experiential-based knowledge, it is important to note that each of these areas has resulted in its own set of debates about quality, ethics, and validity, with its own questions related to subjectivity (Mitchell & Weber, 2005). Scholars such as Ham and Kane (2004) argue that self-study is different from other forms of research because it works to create educational theory that grows from both practice and scholarship and in doing so presents the ontology of teaching and research on teaching differently than past research.

While self-study scholars seek to further our understanding of what might constitute self-study research methodologies and methods, many researchers such as Loughran (2004a), Feldman et al., (2004), Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009), and Hamilton, Smith, and Worthington (2008) seek to clarify some of the similarities and differences between the various qualitative approaches used in teacher research. These comparisons are not meant to draw distinct lines between various qualitative methodologies, but to help highlight when self-study might be the best choice for research inquiry (Hamilton et al., 2008).

Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) compare and contrast six qualitative methodologies in order to situate self-study among qualitative studies and explore the unique aspects of self-study. They choose to briefly examine narrative (a look at self), life history (a look at an individual over time), autoethnography (a look at self within a larger context), action research (a look at technical practice) phenomenology (a look at experience), and self-study (a look at self in relation to practice) (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). Because of the fluid and contextual nature of qualitative research, at times the distinctions are minimal and there is recognition that one

methodology may be used in conjunction with others.

The similarities among these methodologies include situating self and other in a specific time and place within a social context (Hamilton et al., 2008) as well as centering the research from the position of “I.” The distinctions among the “I” positioning are reflected in the depth of the reflexive exploration and whether social and cultural themes emerge (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). This positioning of the researcher as self in relation to others is central to qualitative research studies which seek to trouble the notion of an objective, neutral observer. As well, while the approaches may vary, each methodology uses a form of narrative (Loughran, 2004a). A final similarity is a commitment to altering problematic practices and a desire to support change through research.

While self-study can be said at times to subsume aspects of all the above-mentioned research methodologies, many scholars such as LaBosky (2004) argue that self-study can be distinguished from these other methodologies by its focus on the ontological stance of the researcher. Pinnegar and Hamilton (2008) suggest that how self-study differentiates from other methodologies is the process of dialogue,

This process includes elements of inquiry, reflection, critique, evidence and response to evidence. In order for the dialogue to provide assertions of understanding and action, it must include elements of negotiation and argumentation, interrogation, expansion, and/or expressions of commonality. (p. 88)

This can occur collaboratively with research colleagues, a critical friend, students, or through a dialogue with one’s self or in relation to an abstract idea. Within self-study, a lively debate continues regarding whether collaboration is essential to self-study. Many scholars within self-

study contend that they value the work of both individually-oriented self-studies as well as the interrelationships of collaborative research (Griffiths, Bass, Johnson, & Perselli, 2004; Korthegan & Lunenberg, 2004).

The difference between self-study and other qualitative methodologies is not in the methods or even in the purpose of the approaches; the difference lies in the focus of the experiences (Austin & Senese, 2004). Self-study researchers focus on their practice by examining their personal values through their professional work (Hamilton et al., 2008). The distinctions among these methodological approaches center on the focus of the research and the approach to the research design, whether it be to investigate story, culture, or practice.

The Epistemology and Ontology of Self-Study

Self-study is situated within an emancipatory research framework for two reasons: Self-study scholars describe the knowledge of teaching as socially constructed and situated, and therefore research on knowledge and learning must include ways of identifying and representing the social contexts and interactions in which knowledge is developed (Brown & Strega, 2005; Laboskey, 2004). As well, because so many factors influence the construction of knowledge, the various contexts for teacher learning will produce different kinds of knowledge (LaBoskey, 2004).

Scholars in the field of education have worked to engage multiple epistemologies through feminist, postmodern, Indigenous, poststructural, and postcolonial scholarship (Brown & Strega; 2005; Kovach, 2010). These scholars assert that researchers must find ways to maintain complexity and include more perspectives that disrupt our ways of knowing. As Kumashiro (2004) states, teaching is a knowledge producing activity: “because knowledge of teaching is

uncertain, complex, dynamic, responsive, and context and culture dependent, teachers must be life-long learners engaged in troubling their own practice and imagining different possibilities for teaching and learning” (p. 11). Self-study is a particular stance towards the world which is just one of the many aspects that situate self-study as an emancipatory research framework (Brown & Strega, 2005; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009).

Scholars such as Ham and Kane (2004) argue that self-study is different from other forms of research because it works to create educational theory that grows from both practice and scholarship and in doing so presents the ontology of teaching and research on teaching differently than past research. Self-study research is a moral positioning, a matter of ontology in addition to epistemology. Self-study scholars focused on social justice write from the perspective that self-study must, at its heart, be oppositional (Laboskey, 2004). As Bullough and Pinnegar (2004) state: “The aim of self-study research is to provoke, challenge, and illuminate rather than confirm and settle” (p. 21). Self-study focuses on the interconnection between self and other, theory and practice, research and pedagogy (LaBoskey, 2004).

There are several reasons I chose to use self-study methodology. Identity formation and reconstruction are central to self-study, as well as Foucauldian theories of subject formation and integrative antiracist education. Colonial discourses effect how we are socialized to think about knowledge production and power relations in pedagogy. As LaBoskey (2004) suggests, “We teach who we are, so that learning to teach is not about subject matter or a series of strategies; it is a process of constructing a teaching identity, which is an ongoing development” (p. 114).

In the context of teacher education, LaBoskey (2004) suggests that teachers need to create spaces for students to reinvent themselves both by engaging them in identity

(de)construction activities and by modeling the process ourselves. According to Williams and Ritter (2010), “As people contribute to relationships, they are in turn defined by these relationships, and are therefore involved in a process of identity construction that is evolving, dynamic and an ever constant process of becoming” (p. 81). This is an essential aspect of building transgressive learning spaces, not just for teachers, but for students as well.

In many ways our professionalism demands that, as teachers, we understand our own positioning when adapting our teaching to the students in our classes and the context of the community. Self-study provides a methodology for teachers to be researchers and also positions teachers as learners who can continue to think about our subjectivity. As teachers become more aware of the beliefs and assumptions that drive us, we can become aware of the possible discord between what we think we do and how our students respond. With that awareness comes the ability to learn more about our theories and practices.

Like other self-study researchers, I believe that teachers have to pay attention to how students respond to our teaching. Bullough and Pinnegar (2004) call this “learning by seeing practice through students’ eyes” (p. 327). Educators need to listen to students talking back to us as we work to understand our pedagogy. “Student experience of our practice may open alternative interpretations to situations (to frame and reframe) in order to better understand the complexity of the situation. Students may help us to recognize differences between intentions (beliefs) and practice” (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2004, p. 327).

Attending to students as sources of data for self-study scholarship is less common in public education and a practice encouraged by self-study researchers (Loughran, 2004). In many self-studies it is clear that the authors want to create work that can best be described as artistry

and become more confident at handling situations of uncertainty or contradiction which is integral to social justice education in a colonial context (Cuenca, 2010; Kumashiro, 2000).

Self-Study Methods

According to Bullough and Pinnegar (2004) self-study researchers observe their settings, systematically collect data to capture the observations they are making, consider their own backgrounds, and choose any combination of methods in an attempt to gain insight into their question. The focus on teacher practice in self-study means that qualitative methods are generally used, however quantitative analysis of student evaluations, for example, can also offer insights into teacher practices (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). In self-study research, discourses, visuals and texts often play an important role in shaping our understanding of the research findings (Lunenberg, Zwart, & Korthagen, 2010). For the purposes of this study, I draw from the memory work of my teaching and student interviews in order to investigate how the students and I are subject to nationalist discourses and how our management of language positions us in particular ways. According to Weber and Mitchell (2002), “The object of critical memory work is to make the past usable—a remembering in the service of future action” (p. 122).

It is clear that whatever shape our memories take, they influence the construction of our identities, our current thinking, and our future behaviour. Strong-Wilson (2006), drawing from Thomas King’s (2003) Massey Lecture, notes that it matters which stories we choose to tell, which stories we listen to, and how we choose to hear and understand stories. “By disentangling the threads constituting subjectivity, we can recognize our own stories and become open to re-visioning” (Strong-Wilson, 2006, p. 63).

Self-study teachers are invited to interact with “text” of various kinds in varying manners.

For example, researchers may engage with the professional literature in ways that will inform their personal experience. I have chosen to gather student interviews to draw from their memory, as well as my own, the stories of learning that continue to live in our imaginations after the class has ended. The analysis of stories and texts will provide me with an opportunity to examine my teaching practices and the production of subjectivity and discourse in a classroom where integrative antiracist pedagogy is central to our learning.

In terms of ethical considerations, I have chosen to interview high school students who are no longer in my courses and have already graduated from high school, however this cannot completely disrupt the power relationships produced within teacher/student binaries. While power relationships are always a concern in research studies, it is the responsibility of the researcher to be diligent regarding ethical issues (Brown, 2004; Kovach, 2009). Loughran (2004) explains, “Self-study has been methodologically framed through the question/issue/concern under consideration so that it invokes the use of methods that are most appropriate for uncovering evidence in accordance with the purpose/ intent of the study” (p. 17).

This study solicited, through an email invitation, former students from the Applied Global Citizenship 30 program to participate in an interview. The email requested that students interested in participating in the study contact my co-supervisor Dr. Verna St. Denis (Appendix A - Letter of Invitation). Participation was completely voluntary as participants could decide to respond or not to the invitation to participate and their status as adults meant that they were not a vulnerable group. Each participant was provided with the consent form (Appendix B) and interview schedule (Appendix C) in advance. The consent form specified that interview participants could withdraw without penalty at any point in the interview process.

This study collected data on the experiences of 16 former high school students using interviews as the method of data collection. Participants chose the location of the interview and the interviews were audio taped and varied from one hour to one and a half hours in length. Audio tapes were transcribed verbatim. Participants were also provided with an emailed transcript their interview in order to make corrections, deletions, additions, or other changes they wanted to make to their transcript. They were then asked to sign a transcript release form (Appendix D). While the interview questions were open ended, at times I asked students to elaborate, asked questions I thought were pertinent to the subject we were discussing, or added my own insights and memories to the interview.

While I initially received the participants permission to use their given names, I chose to create names based on ideas that reminded me of them. I made this decision based on the realization that students might be discomforted by an analysis of their interviews. This is one of the difficulties of negotiating the teaching and learning of integrative antiracism. As a teacher, I work to build relationships with students based on mutual trust and respect which means that sometimes when I analyze text or talk, students individualize this analysis to be a personal assessment of their character. While I position myself as part of the dominant group when I am teaching, the process of implicating ourselves in ongoing inequality is still difficult for me and my students. I continue to seek out ways to do this work with compassion while being diligent in disrupting performances of dominance in myself and in others. In the end, this study which should not be read as a study of individuals, but rather a microcosm of the discourses which constitute subjectivities in public school classrooms across the Canadian state.

Throughout this research study, I refer to the subjects of this research as either “students”

or as “participants” interchangeably. While the research participants were no longer my students during their interview, their excerpts are situated in our classroom and are examples of my pedagogy. I chose to maintain the term “students” when the speakers were sharing memories of their classroom experiences, and to provide clear examples of teacher/student constitution.

Discourse Analysis

The purpose of discourse analysis is to investigate the matrices of knowledge and power through which we are constituted (Foucault, 1980). Foucault’s work interrogates how some discourses are produced as “truth,” while others are relegated to the margins and silenced. In this way, discourse analysis does not reveal an objective reality, but rather seeks to interrogate how dominant discourses, as well as discourses which are absent, normalize particular practices. Researchers analyzing how subjectivity is conceptualized in text and talk have studied the discursive actions of identifying, naming, categorizing, and judging, as these serve to structure how individuals and groups are subjectivated.

There are various approaches to discourse analysis which have been used to understand how subjects are constituted in speech and writing. I have chosen to draw from the work of Wetherell and Potter (1992) who use Foucauldian theories to examine how subjects are formed and how the social context is understood and categorized. For example, in their study of white discourse in the colonial context of New Zealand, Wetherell and Potter (1992) note that individuals often follow discursive categories that have become legitimated by arguments that justify or deny racial inequalities. These categories are available discursive practices used by speakers who perform identity and power in the way that they position themselves and what is assumed or left unsaid.

Wetherell and Potter's (1992) framework for discourse analysis requires that the research provide 1) a description of the history and social relations relevant to the area of investigation, 2) an analysis of the patterns of discourse and 3) the ability to connect the latter with the former. "This final moment is vital if we are to argue that certain forms of discourse are implicated in the sustenance and maintenance of particular social patterns" (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 103). Discourse analysis allows me to examine the patterns that emerge when the students and I perform actions such as repositioning ourselves or avoiding complicity. One of the key focuses of discourse analysis in education has been to interrogate how groups manage discourse in a way that reifies unequal relations of power. These studies provide a useful framework for linking certain types of discourses and rhetoric to subjection.

Coding: Themes and sub-themes.

I began by examining my research transcripts to identify themes that were evident. The description of my analysis is organized in the order that I coded the data, however some of the coding process was organic and did not always happen in sequential order. I highlighted the sentences and paragraphs that I believed directly or indirectly connected to student discourse regarding integrative antiracism and social justice and activism. The questions I used to begin to separate the data into the first draft of three major themes are the following: 1) What did students remember about the teaching and learning of integrative antiracist education? 2) How did students define what social justice meant to them? 3) How did students explain what it meant to engage in activism? These questions emerged from the first reading of the participant transcripts.

As part of my process for coding the data, I created informal notes and continued this

practice throughout the stages of data collection and my analysis of the data. I titled this collection of ideas *Rough Notes* which provided me with a writing space to develop my thoughts further after interviews and during the analysis of my data. My *Rough Notes* journaling allowed me to write through stages of the research process when my ideas were unclear. I also had several booklets that I used to work with the themes that were emerging from the data. These included quotations from participant interviews and notes to myself regarding initial thoughts and the connection to particular themes.

The first three major themes that emerged from the interview data were as follows: 1) *The Canadian identity*; 2) *The Teaching and Learning of Antiracism*; and 3) *Activism & Social Justice*. These major themes were then divided into sub-themes—ideas that were commonly repeated by students. For example, under the theme 1) *The Canadian identity*, I organized excerpts into four sub-themes by highlighting words and metaphors that emerged from more than one interview. These began as sub-themes titled: a) *grand narratives of goodness* b) *identity and positioning* c) *silencing* and d) *emotional work*. The creation of these sub-themes under the title Canadian identity became the data analysis for Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 under the broad theme of making national subjects.

Initially, I organized the data for 2) *The Teaching and Learning of Antiracism* with the idea that I would analyze what students had learned in the AGC30 course and how this may or may not have had an impact on how they thought and talked about themselves and their world view. In reviewing the data, I recognized that students talked extensively about what they had learned in their K-12 public schooling. I did not ask any questions about other courses, but students often juxtaposed the AGC30 course with their previous school experiences. The

analysis of this data shows how pedagogy regulates students' bodies in Chapter 4 of this study.

The last major theme 3) *Activism & Social Justice*, was divided into sub-themes that included a) *models of social justice activism*, b) *how students understand social change*, c) *hopelessness/hope*, and d) *acts of resistance*. Most of this data became Chapter 8 on technologies of empire. I changed the titles of some of the chapters and sub-themes, and reorganized the data in ways that best conveyed the scholarship that would inform my analysis in each chapter. My decision to organize the data in a particular way was to make a clear connection between nationalist discourses, knowledge production in schools, and teacher/student subjection.

Language and subjection.

Once the data was organized into themes and sub-themes, my co-supervisor Dr. Verna St. Denis and I co-created the final set of questions that would frame my analysis: What are the metaphors students use to talk about their identity? More specifically, what words are attached? What form of social justice agency is being activated? Are students the donors or recipients? What is being accomplished? These questions allowed me to begin to look at specific language and metaphors to analyze how students positioned themselves through their words, investigating the reproduction of particular subjectivities.

Initially, I found it difficult to analyze student subjection because ordinary discourse or everyday text and talk is not neatly organized, but fragmented with shifting patterns. As Wetherell and Potter (1992) suggest "People in lay talk have access to a compendium of different interpretive resources which blend together to produce a wide variety of different effects" (p. 92). However, loosely tracing the steps of Wetherall and Potter's (1992) discourse

analysis provided me with a framework that was helpful.

While there were times during the process of data analysis that discourses and their effects seemed clearly evident to me, there are also many layers of meaning that I chose not to focus on or did not see. Although my data analysis was a non-linear process, there were three steps I alternated through continuously: 1) I reviewed other research studies where scholars analyzed the discourses of students and teachers in social justice and antiracist education (for example, Marx, 2004; North, 2007; Raby, 2004; Schick, 2000a; Schick & St. Denis, 2005; St. Denis & Schick, 2003; Youdell, 2006b); 2) I read the students' language patterns as social practices, situating their discourses within the context of white settler colonialism; 3) I read students management of language as self-surveillance in order to analyze their self-constitution and positioning.

For example, there are numerous instances where students could articulate what they learned in the course using language such as "oppression" or discussing "white supremacy." However they often positioned themselves outside of these relations of power, as though having an insight excluded them from complicity in white supremacy and domination. These patterns of discourse are significant as they positioned students as superior to other dominant group members simply through their critical insights and special status as dominant youth involved in social justice. This type of subjection requires further analysis and strategies for disruption. The data analysis in this research study is constrained by the discourses that I chose to highlight and name and my capacity to represent them. Understanding the subject as discursively constituted, but with discursive agency has urged me to think about how teachers/ students come to "be," performing our identity in particular ways (Youdell, 2006a).

As with all research, discourse analysis cannot avoid constituting the world in a particular way. The analysis of discourse can be viewed as an intervention which may disrupt certain discourses while constituting and reproducing others (Kumashiro, 2000). As Foucault (1990) contends, discourses that carry public authority regulate bodies and shape the desires and practices of entire populations. To imagine that my students and I could escape these socializing mechanisms would be problematic. Instead, this research sought to investigate what could be learned from partial representations of a complex field of discourses and constitutions.

As with all research, I made decisions regarding “cutting” or what to leave out of my dissertation and what would remain in the analysis. There were several themes and excerpts from the data that were not included in the analysis of this research study. For example, the AGC30 course focused on social and ecological justice, and environmental issues were a theme in the data. Some of the excerpts where students discussed this theme were used in my article titled, *The whiteness of green: Racialization and environmental education*, (McLean, 2013). Based on the excerpts of 9 of the participants who talked about their experiences in outdoor education, I examined how whiteness is reinscribed in outdoor education programs where antiracist education and Indigenous issues were absent from the curriculum. I made a decision to leave this data out of my dissertation and focus on participant discussions of identity markers such as race, gender and sexuality.

Another theme that emerged from the data that I chose not to include was student discussions of their mixed race identity. While this data is significant for understanding how racial formations produce particular subjectivities, I recognized that this would require a body of scholarship for my analysis that was separate from the research I was drawing from in order to

understand whiteness and national discourses.

Initially I included a section in Chapter 6 on student discussions of the AGC30 program as a “safe space”. This language contradicted students’ description of the course as discomforting and upsetting. How was the classroom both safe and discomforting? There is research that investigates how dialogue that is “safe” for dominant groups will not constitute safe discussions for marginalized groups (Leonardo, 2009; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012). I would like to examine this data further, however I chose to focus on other ways that national discourse regulate and constrain antiracist education.

These are just a few examples of some of the outlier data and data that I chose not to include in this dissertation. My decisions to address some themes and not others, or choose particular excerpts were based on my initial intention to examine the themes that were most prevalent from the student interviews.

Conclusion

LaBoskey (2004) argues that self-study scholars are guided by moral, ethical, and political values and ideals, stating that equity and social justice are core values for self-study researchers. Many self-study scholars, including LaBoskey, maintain that self-study scholarship is centered on liberatory education in that it focuses on educators taking responsibility for transforming their own practice (Brown, 2004; Kumashiro, 2004; Loughran, 2004; Northfield & Loughran, 1997; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2004). An integrative antiracist approach to education with an equity agenda has been identified by many as a social justice orientation. Loughran (2004), LaBoskey (2004), Milner (2007), and Mitchell et al. (2005) call for self-study research that serves to further investigate social justice in education,

There are critical areas of methodology and self-study that remain to be explored. These areas include the need to expand the repertoire for addressing class, race and culture, to the possibilities for sex and the body to become more central to self-study; and finally to the ways in which the study of selves/self can become more central (and documented within) institutional change and transformation! (Mitchell et al., 2005, p. 8)

Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) also appeal for self-study which focuses on social justice as they assert that, “improvement of practice includes a commitment to an elimination of domination, exploitation, and discrimination of any one over another and a sensitivity to the many facets of diversity” (Preface).

Chapter 4: Situating Myself in the Study

The challenge in radical education becomes how to build critical consciousness about how we, as subjects, position ourselves as innocent through the use of such markers of identity as the good activist. (Razack, 1998, p. 18)

This chapter on situating myself in the study will examine my subjectivity drawing from the scholarship on white identity construction in a colonial context (Frankenberg, 1993; Leonardo, 2009; McClintock, 1995; Norque, 1993; Razack, 1998; Schick, 2000a & 2000b; Stoler, 1995; Thobani, 2007; Thompson, 2003). Using Foucault's (1995) notion of the Panopticon, this chapter will show how my teaching identity has been produced through discursive practices of feminine goodness and care, and maintained through self-surveillance. Through memory work, as well as excerpts from two different periods of my life where I wrote about my teaching identity, I will show how these discourses position me as both innocent and superior. The excerpts I have chosen for this chapter are from my thesis titled, *Beyond the pale: Whiteness as innocence in education* (2007), and a section I wrote for the book, *The Winter We Danced: Voices from the past, the future and the Idle No More movement* (2014). In particular, I will suggest that teacher performances of the white savior/antiracist hero both embody a desire for safety and innocence.

I do not write this chapter to say that my teaching identity is only one thing, but rather to "show the complex means by which we are tied into existing subject positions . . . and just how difficult it is to move from those discursively constituted positions that we find ourselves occupying" (Davies, 1999, p. 16). After 10 years of research, teaching, and activism, there are still many tensions in the work that I do, something Ellsworth (1997) calls a double bind of

whiteness, referring to the complex historicity and situatedness of subjection that makes the reinscription of whiteness complex. As Leonardo (2009) warns, “No amount or resignifying race can escape its problems” (p. 89). I write this chapter in order to further my own understanding of some of the ways in which dominance is reproduced by white teachers engaged in social justice, and think through how we might change some of these practices. The section below titled *Reflecting back* will analyze my identity as a white cis female teacher working in what was labelled alternative education in the early part of my career. The second section titled *Practices of the self* will discuss how I use self-surveillance to maintain innocence and superiority as an antiracist teacher and researcher, and finally *Shifting pedagogies* will share some insights and possibilities for white antiracist teachers in a colonial context.

Reflecting Back

I am a third generation white settler with Norwegian grandparents on my mother’s side, and a Scottish grandfather and Swedish grandmother on my father’s side. Both families earned lower middle-class status through various aspects of farming on the prairies, and I grew up in a city just a few hours away from their farms. My parents, aunts, and uncles all spoke English and assimilated into the national culture of whiteness through various institutions such as church, community gatherings, and what was aptly termed Normal School, once described to me as a one-room schoolhouse where students completed several grades. Many of the women in my family were homemakers, teachers, or nurses, all positions that, according to Schick (2000) were appropriate for white settler women earning respectability in a patriarchal settler state. My subject position as a white cis woman was “inscribed in larger narratives of family, race and nation” (Weems, 2004 p. 225), making it seem natural for me to choose teaching.

Nation-building practices exalted white women through discourses of morality and sexual purity, which regulated the racial and sexual norms that determined social and political status (McClintock, 1995; Stoler, 1995). While nationalist discourses are defined by their exclusion of women from positions of social and political power, white women's roles in reproducing language and culture is essential for understanding national character (Rankin, 2000). As Berry (2007) suggests, "The family's position and positioning of me in whiteness was compatible, in most cases, with the Canadian societal and civilizational knowledge and values of the times that still reverberate today" (p. 22). White women occupy a distinct role in nationalist culture as they secure internal boundaries of difference through various practices such as the reproduction of future citizens and enacting normative femininity.

Like most white children growing up on the prairies, my subjectivity was constituted through national narratives that my grandparents built a life from nothing, signifying our collective citizenship as earned through superior morals and work ethics. These discourses were significant in reifying liberal individualism, providing common sense explanations for the vast inequalities we would witness. The access my grandfather had in the early 1900s to farm land, citizenship, voting rights, public education, mobility rights, bank loans, and government relief during famine secured their upward mobility and our middle-class status.

While white settlers like my grandparents certainly worked hard to provide for their families, it was the government policies that created differential access to resources that produced our social and political power. In the same historical moment that my family was constituted and exalted as white citizens of the state, Indigenous people faced genocidal policies such as the ongoing dispossession of lands, Indian Act legislation, Residential schools, the Pass

System, disenfranchisement, and forced starvation (Thobani, 2007; Wolf, 2006). The discourses of nationhood produced racialized inequality as natural and normal, particularly for those of us that benefitted from it.

While I grew up in a neighborhood and went to public school with Indigenous children and children of color, these experiences of friendship did not challenge the dominant discourses of *difference* that permeated our communities. My undergraduate degrees in Arts and Science and Education included some courses that were critical of the status quo. I chose classes in satiric literature, sociology, history, and political studies, and was introduced to Marxist theories. Armed with a class analysis, I began teaching as a substitute teacher in an urban public school system in 1991, and have held part-time and full-time teaching positions at four different high schools for the same school board. The first half of my career was spent teaching English, history, Native Studies, and media studies in my former high school where a high number of Indigenous students and students of color were enrolled. The second half of my career I taught the AGC 30 course to classes with predominantly white settler students, which is the subject of this research study.

Early in my career I garnered a reputation of being a good teacher by engaging in work that was designated as alternative education. Alternative education in my school system was marked by alterations to institutional norms that organized curricular, spatial, and temporal practices of schooling. These practices were produced through binary constructions of students marked as “advanced” in their studies, and students produced as “at risk.” This distribution of bodies was racialized in ways that courses for advanced students were constructed as white spaces, while programs for students marked as “at risk” were created with Indigenous students

and students of color in mind. Labels such as “at risk” served to mark students as deficit, erasing the mechanisms of dominance which created oppressive and unsafe conditions for youth who were marginalized. For the first 10 years of my career I primarily taught students who were marginalized by systems of white heteronormative dominance. This section on reflecting back will investigate how my identity as a good teacher was produced through my early work with Indigenous students and students of color who were marked by discourses of deficiency.

My desire to embody what it meant to be a good teacher began in my internship and continues to play out in various ways. The multiple layers of what it means for me to be a good teacher are reproduced through discourses of white femininity and care (McWilliam, 2004; Razack, 1998; Schick, 2000a). As McWilliam (2004) suggests, the discourses of the caring teacher produce what Foucault terms as “prescriptive texts” that regulate how one will perform (p. 139). The pleasures I derived from caring for students were structured by notions of good teaching, so that it would be difficult for me to feel like or be recognizable as a good teacher without performing care.

The construction of white femininity as caring naturalizes the propensity of white women drawn to teaching, as bodies that both signify and regulate particular societal norms. As Schick (2000a) suggests, the subjectivity of the teacher is produced through particular gendered, raced, and sexual identities that are performed as both normative and desirable. To be a white woman who performs femininity means that I signal heterosexuality, a necessary marker for regulating heteronormative social mores (Butler, 1993, 1997). Historical accounts of white women as caretakers reproduce settler colonial values as norms that inscribe the national subject (Heron, 2007; Schick, 2000a). The discursive practices of white women as caretakers are reproduced

through all of the helper professions such as child welfare, international worker, and teacher (Heron, 2007).

Our identities as white teachers are cultivated through various discursive processes and social practices steeped in nation building (Stanley, 2006; Willinsky, 1998). Discourses of goodness and benevolence describe the nation, the citizen, and the teacher (Schick, 2000a; Weems, 2004). Foucault (1990) contends that racialized sexualities produced citizen-subjects that are marked as either normative or deviant. Within this context, white teachers become the gatekeepers for the reproduction of nationhood, and schools are one of the places where racial, gendered, and sexual boundaries continue to be drawn and redrawn for the masses (Razack, 1998; Willinsky, 1998; Youdell, 2006b).

In many ways, my good teaching was performed through iterations of the white savior (Cammarota, 2011; Razack, 1998). In these narratives, the lone white teacher saves marginalized students from their dire circumstances and offers them redemption. Foucault (1983) refers to these practices as pastoral power, where discourses of self-sacrifice, individual salvation, and expert “knowing” shape subject positions. These discourses produce relations of power that maintain whiteness as dominance, as Cammarota (2011) states,

The lack of human agency among people of color is perhaps the most offensive aspect of the white savior productions. The oppressed have no other choice but to follow the leadership of oppressors who generally choose to oppress but occasionally choose to play the role of savior. These productions undermine the value of indigenous ideas for shaping the destiny of native people. Moreover, most native people would have been fine

and not in need of rescuing were it not for the exploitation of the saviors' people in the first place. (p. 248)

Popular films such as *Dangerous Minds* and more recently *Freedom Writers* exalt the white teacher savior, subsequently erasing the agency of students and communities of color that continue to lead resistance and resurgence in multiple ways. In the white savior trope, the teacher does not work against oppressive colonial structures, but rather reproduces deficit narratives and white redemption.

In my first few years of teaching classes to youth who are marginalized by systems of dominance, I can recall refusing to enact various school rules in my classroom. One was the “10 and out” rule where students would be removed from class after 10 absences, and the other was the “hat rule” where students were asked to remove their hats during class time. In reflecting back, while I believed I was questioning arbitrary school rules that further alienated students, my resistance reified dominant narratives that positioned students as incapable of carrying out these rules. In other words, by challenging school rules I reinscribed discourses of marginalized youth as different and deficient. It is also clear to me now (and may have been then) that because my whiteness was reproduced through performances of care and moral superiority over educators who did not “get it” (Thompson, 2003), I was never disciplined for insubordination. Instead, I was offered a leadership position as Student Representative Council Advisor, and eventually given other opportunities to advance my career. This is one of many ways discourses of whiteness regulate what constitutes knowledge and who has the authority to speak (Foucault, 1995).

In using this example, I am not suggesting that these rules were unproblematic. I was

teaching in a context where Indigenous students and students of color were under constant surveillance. What I am suggesting is that the students and I were co-constituted through pedagogy, and this was how whiteness was accomplished. The discursive practices of white femininity and care made it difficult to question my motives or daily operations, particularly as a white cis woman teaching youth of color (Camarota, 2011). Our subjectivities as white teachers are naturalized and inscribed as above reproach, making any slippage unintelligible (Butler, 1993). My performance as a good person/caring teacher reproduced white savior narratives. This meant that it mattered little whether I followed school rules or worked against them, I was always valorized as doing the best for students as a caring teacher, and these discursive practices protected and secured my position in the school system. While I can recall times that the work I did may have challenged whiteness, these instances did not change how I was positioned or taken up. My identity as a good white teacher was reinforced at every turn.

My performance of the caring teacher was also easily read by the students in my courses. The excerpt below comes from my Master's thesis where I talked about my identity as a white teacher:

I can remember feeling pleased each time an Aboriginal student suggested to me that I was “not like a white person”, believing this was the highest compliment that could be bestowed upon me. I spoke of power and authority with complete disregard for my own position of privilege, and despite my intentions, I continue to find new ways to reproduce my own innocence within a racist society. (Mclean, 2007, p. 21)

This excerpt shows how Indigenous students were not only naming whiteness, but also commenting on my performance of whiteness. What I thought was advocacy for students,

actually worked to produce me as superior to other white teachers who followed the rules and positioned me as a “good white” to students. This reinforced the idea that I was not only a good teacher, but could somehow transcend whiteness through particular acts. The positive responses I received encouraged me to continue challenging practices in my classroom and the school.

It is significant to note that I was not teaching about whiteness or white supremacy during this time period, yet I clearly understood what students meant when they said I was not acting like a white person, “believing this was the highest compliment that could be bestowed upon me.” Rather than contest their statement, or puzzle the impossibility of being called “not-white,” I worked to appear further removed from colonial relations of power and innocent of the violence required to maintain it. As Thompson (2003) states, “The desire to be and to be known as a good white person stems from the recognition that our whiteness is problematic, a recognition that we try to escape by being demonstrably different from other, racist whites” (p. 9). This is one example of the various ways that I dissociated “from the revulsion of genocide and colonization” in order to accomplish myself as a good teacher and a good white (Schick, 2000b, p. 90).

These memories from my early teaching demonstrate Leonardo’s (2009) contention that white people know far more about whiteness than we are willing to admit. White racial knowledge structures the discursive practices of white teachers. The goal of my analysis in *Reflecting back* is to reveal how subject categories are constructed through discourse (Norquay, 1993; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). The example here is just one of many that could be used to analyze how I embodied whiteness as a teacher, and how these practices are a constant seduction for those of us who occupy positions of power. This analysis provides an alternate reading of

how my identity as a good teacher was produced, and invites me to think about how I have maintained and/or challenged these discursive practices.

Practices of the Self

This study is a culmination of the last 10 years of my learning and teaching in integrative antiracist theory. It also represents snapshots of my pedagogy, although pedagogy is an ongoing process that is contextual and changes over time. This study has altered the way I think about my subjectivity. This is not because I have not interrogated my location as a white cis woman involved in solidarity work, however this self-study has provided me with further insights. My teaching is fraught with contradictions, so much so that disrupting one oppressive tactic reifies another (Kumashiro, 2000). Thompson (2003) states that while white antiracists are generally willing to acknowledge dominance, it is much more difficult to acknowledge that fact about ourselves. This is especially true for white women produced as caring teachers, who desire innocence in a settler colonial context.

This section is not meant to be a confessional which can be problematized as doing little besides re-centering white guilt as the problem that requires attention (Thompson, 2003). This section called *Practices of the self* allows me to investigate how teaching integrative antiracism as a white cis woman reinscribes my goodness and superiority. As antiracist educator Thompson (2003) suggests, white people working in antiracism are sometimes seduced into congratulating ourselves for having ‘evolved’ into an antiracist hero, which reifies whiteness. Foucault (1995) contends that the subject is constructed through practice, something which Butler (1993) also suggests must be reconstituted again and again. This section will suggest that my performances of the white savior and the antiracist hero embody similar desires for “safety, blamelessness and

certainty” (Thompson, 2003, 8).

The last 10 years of my teaching and study have been focused on completing a Masters and PhD program in integrative antiracist theory and practice. I have also developed and taught courses on integrative antiracism to undergraduate and graduate students in education. Certainly, I have developed knowledge and insights over this time period, however it is important to investigate how the discursive practices of innocence and certainty continue to form my subjectivity. To begin with, my Master’s thesis, *Beyond the pale: Whiteness as innocence in education* (McLean, 2007) was conducted as a study of predominantly white teachers in two high schools on the prairies. The study was a replication of a research study by Julie Kailin (1999) called “*How white teachers perceive the problem of racism in their schools: A case study in ‘liberal’ Lakeview,*” which analyzed common discourses used by white educators that reproduce a context of white supremacy. The goal of the study was to analyze how white teacher identity constructions of innocence are reproduced in an education system where racial inequalities are pervasive and systemic. My findings suggested that it is critical to consider the identity constructions of white teachers, as these constructions will influence how we interpret and respond to existing racial inequalities in education.

In many ways, my thesis reinforced my authority over other white teachers. While I positioned myself in the study, and wrote about my complicity, the remainder of the 100 page document was devoted to analyzing and critiquing the problematic discourses of other white teachers. My desire to complete this particular study, and my confidence regarding the findings, all served to produce me as one of the good whites. This move constitutes me as both an insider/outsider on the colonial landscape, as I maintained all of the benefits of my subjectivity

as a white cis-hetero able-bodied teacher, while critiquing the very systems that reproduced my superiority. Moves to innocence may vary for those of us engaged in integrative antiracism, however they accomplish the same end, which is to avoid complicity in the face of colonial violence. I could have structured the study in a way that positioned me alongside my colleagues, such as a participatory action research study with teachers that included sessions on integrative antiracism for those involved in the study. While the purpose of the study was not to “catch them out” making racist statements (Schick, 2000b) it did position me as a teacher/researcher that was both innocent of these practices, and also savvy enough to recognize/analyze the “bad” practices of other white teachers. I exercised the power of utilizing antiracist language and as Schick (2000b) notes, “Acquiring this discourse gives the new pastoral elite a useful technology for discerning the particular failings of their peers” (p. 95).

This is not to say that my research study on white teacher identity construction was not important. It was vital to my understanding of how whiteness is regulated in schools, and what it might mean to possibly disrupt these practices. As well, my research partner and I were accountable to the teacher-participants when we went back to share our findings with the staff for professional development. However my thesis on racism in public schools served my desire to escape whiteness by doing “the right kind of work.” As Thompson (2003) notes, “Regarding ourselves as authoritatively antiracist, we keep whiteness at the center of antiracism” (p. 8). The work I was often engaged in during this time period distanced me from my colleagues as a way to maintain my identity as a good white teacher.

It is important to investigate the various narratives I have used to represent my decision to study and teach integrative antiracism, and how these discourses constitute me as a caring

teacher and a good white. In the following excerpt from my Master's thesis I share an insight about my desire to study and teach integrative antiracism:

While I initially believed I chose this field in order to support the many students I have taught over the years, I have come to the realization that I was drawn to anti-racist education in hopes of further erasing my own whiteness. (McLean, 2007, p. 104)

In a piece I wrote 7 years later called *Idle No More: Re-storying Canada* (2014) I suggested once again that I chose integrative antiracism to support the students I had taught:

My recognition of the magnitude of the violent racism Indigenous student's face daily within our school and community propelled me back to university into a graduate program in integrative antiracist education. (p. 92)

It is clear that this discourse positioned me as a caring teacher and good person, innocent of dominance until I learned to be an antiracist teacher. This may be one of the reasons that I have shared the second reason publically more times than I have shared the first. While the students did have a significant impact on my decision to take graduate studies, this self-constitution was in keeping with my desire for goodness. I am sharing these excerpts to show patterns of self-surveillance that shift over time. What is sayable about my whiteness has sometimes depended on who I perceive the audience to be, how it might be understood, and my own comfort in sharing particular things (Leonardo, 2009). As Thompson (2003) suggests, "The insistence on feeling good about ourselves and projecting ourselves as 'good whites' is in part a determination to tell the story of our whiteness our own way—to be in control of the racial meanings used to identify us" (p. 23). Of course this desire for control applies to this dissertation as well. As I

think about the work I have done since learning integrative antiracist theory, much of it attests to my continued struggles with a desire for innocence.

Shifting Pedagogies

In the section on *Reflecting back*, I wrote about how my subjectivity as a good white teacher was co-produced by the marking of Indigenous students and students of color as deficient. In *Practices of the self*, I provide examples of some of the ways I reinscribe this through self-surveillance. In this section on *Shifting pedagogies*, I will think through whether and how solidarity work has shifted my teaching and activism.

My reputation as a good teacher was known to some administrators. This meant that when I returned from my educational leave I was given further opportunities for leadership as a Gay-Straight Alliance Advisor as well as a Learning Leader¹. I was also offered the opportunity to teach the locally developed course called Applied Global Citizenship 30 to students in an advanced program at a predominantly white school. I taught this course using a student-centered pedagogy similar to what I had used in the past, however instead of focusing on the effects of colonialism and oppression, I also taught about how dominance was produced and maintained.

The first few years of teaching integrative antiracism to high school students were filled with trial and error. There was some resistance to the course and it took some time for me to accept the students' discomfort as it challenged my identity as a good and caring teacher. In order to feel like I was doing "good work," I would compare what I was doing in the high school program with the third year education students who were taking antiracism courses from me at the same time. Thompson (2003) suggests that as teachers, we often assume to know what

¹ Learning Leaders were chosen as staff facilitators in the areas of educational praxis.

counts as genuine antiracist learning by white students. At the time I was unaware (or unwilling to acknowledge) how much I did not know. As teachers we are produced as experts in our field, and of course antiracist heroes require the safety and security of “knowing” what is best.

It was clear from the outset that I had the support of the administration and the school system in teaching the AGC30 course. The program was celebrated in various ways such as inviting us to present our program to the school board and other places. The institutional discourses of individualism situated me as an exceptional teacher. Programs like the AGC30 are used to signify school systems as progressive and supportive of social justice without actually challenging any of the problematic school board practices.

While the opportunity to teach a course such as AGC30 was important, it is also essential to think about what courses like this accomplish, and how they mitigate institutional and systemic change. As a white cis woman signifying care and good teaching I was able to transgress some of the boundaries of the institution and continue to be supported and/or valorized. However, I also remember examples when this began to change.

In one instance, the students I worked with in the Gay-Straight Alliance had an idea to collaborate with other GSA's (eat pizza) and brainstorm a set of clear recommendations for the school system. This came from ongoing conversations where we recognized that while GSAs are an essential space for queer and Two-Spirit youth, they were not enough to address the context of heteronormativity that permeated the schools and community. I sent an invitation to all the GSA advisors in our school system and was promptly contacted by the administration and told that we were not allowed to meet without approval from various levels of administration, and that this would require a proposal and decision making that could take months or longer for

approval. While one may argue that going through the proper channels is important, I was struck by the quick and steady regulation and surveillance of any organizing outside of the institutional gaze. An attempt to organize beyond an individual GSA appeared to be a concern for the school board.

The other example occurred in the same year before my educational leave. Over the span of several years, AGC30 students attended various community events and helped organize and speak at rallies. In the winter of 2013 when the Idle No More movement erupted across the nation-state, our class attended the first rally. Another colleague teaching a social justice program asked permission to take his class to the rally and his request was declined. I did not find out until our class returned from the rally that we did not have permission to go. I had never had to ask for permission to attend rallies before, as community events were part of the AGC30 course curriculum and I had grown accustomed to making decisions without attending to school authority and policies.

In the year before my educational leave I was reprimanded on several occasions - something that was new to me. My white femininity worked in ways (and I performed my white femininity in ways) that gave me the freedom and entitlement that was rarely extended to other teachers, particularly non-normative teachers that identify as Indigenous, queer, or teachers of color. I also did not fully comprehend the threat the Idle No More movement made to state institutions, and that our participation and support would be read as vastly different than the other rallies we had attended as a class.

I share these two examples to show how the individualized performances of white saviors and antiracist heroes are of little threat or consequence to school systems because we embody

and uphold state sanctioned values of whiteness in all of our practices. It is the reification of the autonomous white subject (Schick, 2000a). As well, individual courses in integrative antiracism and singular GSAs can do some important things to disrupt the oppressively hegemonic context of schools for marginalized students; however if they are tokenized they will do little to shift institutional practices. It was only through attempts to organize collectively with others that I came to experience how school systems work to regulate, discipline, and even silence broader actions towards change.

The opportunities I have had to organize with students and colleagues have been the most powerful in shifting my pedagogy and effecting change. Scholars and activists who write about solidarity work suggest that although we are positioned differently in the struggle, we can work across difference towards shared goals of justice and ending colonial state violence (Bishop, 2002; Dhamoon, 2009; Razack, 1998; St. Denis, 2007; Walia, 2014). As St. Denis (2007) states:

Colonization and racialization are also what tie Aboriginal people to non-Aboriginal people. We have long since ceased to be islands unto ourselves. The many social, economic, and educational problems faced by Aboriginal people have been created and are profoundly situated in historical and contemporary social, economic, and political conditions . . . Coalitions and alliances can be made within and across the diversity of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples lives through a common understanding and commitment to anti-racist education. (p. 1087)

I have been told repeatedly and on many different occasions by Indigenous scholars and activist who are my mentors that solidarity work is essential for long term systemic change.

Over the last 10 years I have found ways to organize with other people interested in

challenging oppression. For example, I work with a network of Indigenous and non-Indigenous teachers in a provincial organization called SAFE (Social Justice and Anti-racist Anti-oppressive Forum on Education). Our network organizes educational opportunities such as conferences and gatherings for teachers and community members interested in integrative antiracist theory and practice. I have also helped organize campaigns that focus on community education and non-violent direct action in Treaty 6 territory and more recently across many Indigenous territories as part of the Idle No More movement.

I am not suggesting that organizing and solidarity work will resolve all the tensions that whiteness and social difference creates, however it has shifted how I position myself as a white cis woman as well as some of my pedagogical practices. Taking an account of how we are implicated in domination requires a commitment to disrupting hierarchies of power. As Dhamoon (2007) suggests,

One way of mobilizing this ethical commitment is to create alliances so as to collectively respond to various manifestations of domination. Moreover, collective disruption can provide a basis for alliances and resistance, and it helps to keep allied individuals and groups accountable and responsible to one another. (p. 149)

I have continued to challenge school policies, but rather than do this alone I work alongside a network of Indigenous and non-Indigenous, queer, and Two-Spirit teachers and community members. The solidarity work I am involved in is a public refusal of the logics of white settler colonialism. Working across difference is context specific and requires relationships of respect and trust that can only be built over time. As Thompson (2003) contends, “What will count as antiracist will change as we take on new lived possibilities,” which will require new embodied

responses (p. 20). This means that those of us engaged in integrative antiracist education must commit to ongoing practices of (un)learning.

Chapter 5: Regulating Bodies; Making Docile Subjects

After 10 years of teaching high school, I was asked to develop a school for adult learners with three colleagues. We created an open campus atmosphere where there were no set schedules or bells, and students worked at their own pace to complete credits.

Interestingly, after a few months we began to call the larger high school where we had all formerly taught “the plant” (read: factory plant), in comparison. After 3 years in the adult program, I applied for a leave to complete my M. Ed., and when I returned a year later, I was transferred back into a regular high school setting. I recall feeling overwhelmed by the packed hallways, the strict scheduling, the meetings, expectations, and particularly the bells. I felt tense and uncomfortable for about 2 months, and then somehow it all felt normal again.

This chapter will analyze excerpts from data coded Schooling and Learning. This study contends that public schools are technologies of control where signs, symbols, ideologies, and practices work together to exercise power in a way that has particular effects. Drawing from Foucault’s (1995) theory of subjectivation, this chapter investigates what kind of power relations are exercised in pedagogy. Foucault argues that these disciplinary devices create tactics of power and control which is significant for analyzing how schools may reproduce particular relations of power. Foucault (1995) argues that the technologies used to construct particular subjectivities are institutionalized; the implementation of reports, assessments, and control over space and movement used in schools serve to regulate bodies and produce docile subjects. In turn, these technologies manufacture particular subjectivities by producing norms and self-images that people internalize as the truth about themselves. In this way, Foucault’s concept of

disciplinary power shifts from analyzing the macro realm of power structures and ideologies to the micro level of bodies. As Foucault (1995) states:

In thinking of the mechanisms of power, I am thinking rather of its capillary form of existence, the point where power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their action and attitude, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives. (p. 39)

The process of subjectivation refers to the discursive practices which produce people as social subjects and subjects them to relations of power. Drawing from Chapter 2, this chapter will investigate how Foucault's theory of subjectivation can be useful in helping to understand how power is embedded in pedagogy. In *Discipline and Punish* (1995) Foucault outlines five disciplinary devices which will be used to organize the data analysis in this chapter: 1) hierarchal observation, 2) normalizing judgment, 3) the examination, 4) panopticism, and 5) surveillance/self-surveillance. Foucault contends that each of these devices are regulating techniques that construct normativity, but also individualize difference by making it possible to measure variations and gaps from an imposed value system. As Foucault (1990) states, "Let us ask . . . how things work at the level of ongoing subjugation, at the level of those continuous and uninterrupted processes which subject our bodies, govern our gestures, dictate our behaviors, etc." (p. 16). Foucault seeks to understand subjection in its material instance as a constitution of subjects. In this Chapter I explore how the school practices described by student- participants in this study might be understood using Foucauldian theories of power.

The excerpts from these interviews provide examples of discursive practices and exemplify their familiarity in schooling across Canada. For each disciplinary technique, I have

provided some specific examples, however it is clear that these excerpts could legitimately appear in more than one category which indicates that multiple techniques of power are being enacted at any given time. This chapter will also explore how particular disciplinary devices govern the co-production of *good teacher* and *good student*.

Hierarchal Observation: Teaching as Authority

Foucault (1995) maintains that hierarchal observation involves structuring institutions so that individuals positioned as having greater authority, such as school principals and teachers, have responsibility and oversee those marked with less authority such as students. As educators, we play an important role in creating and maintaining hierarchal observation through our practice as authority figures. We become the “professional experts” which have been trained to perform repetitious disciplinary techniques in our daily classroom pedagogy. In fact, technical-rationality is a significant part of our training as pre-service teachers and throughout our career. As Cappello (2013) states;

Technical rationality refers to the particular expression of reason that flows out of the Enlightenment and characterizes a modern Western sensibility. Technical rationality is the response of the rational subject to problems encountered. This form of reason emphasizes objectivity and the scientific neutrality of the practices of experts, privileging the language and practices of science. The application of reason embodied in techniques is at the heart of a technical response to the world. (p. 122)

As noted in the introduction, over 90% of teachers in Canada are white, and those in administrative positions such as directors, principals, superintendents, teaching positions such as senior math and science classes vs. kindergarten classes, and in staff positions such as secretary

vs. caretakers are still primarily racialized and gendered in schools and school board offices across the country (Carr & Klassen, 1997; Marx, 2004; Raby, 2004; Schick, 2000b). As well, the context of heteronormativity means that many queer teachers and students perform straightness regardless of their sexuality. This context has been centered in the following analysis in order to understand how particular kinds of power are reified in classrooms. The dominant figures of authority in schools are marked by constellations of whiteness, maleness, and the performance of straightness so that when I discuss the authority of the teacher, there are particular subjectivities that constitute what *authority* can mean. Any transgressions of societal norms (such as gender, sexuality, or race) may shift how teacher as authority is understood or made intelligible (Butler, 1993). Furthermore the construction of teacher as authority normalizes the submission in the broader society to particular kinds of institutional and governmental authority..

Teachers are constructed as authority figures in the classroom and this is rarely challenged, even in the most liberal school programs. As Gore (1995) points out, one only has to watch children play school to see how these disciplinary techniques are normalized and performed unquestioningly in our expectations and responses. When I asked students about the AGC30 program, they shared thoughts regarding schooling and learning in general. In particular, students often discussed other classes or experiences with teachers.

Erin: teachers even don't understand the things that these kids go through. And when you're a kid and when you're a student in school at any grade, even in university, you go to your teacher for advice, for guidance. You think that they know everything and when

they reinforce dominant ideas of your inferiority, without even knowing it maybe, that makes you not want to be in school.

This conversation with Erin was familiar in that it indicated how teachers were constructed as experts and how students internalized messages they received from their teacher regarding how they were valued in an educational context and who they could *become* (Youdell, 2006b). This is part of the individualism and classification that takes place regularly in schools. When Erin said, “you think that they know everything,” this indicated the constructs of teachers not only as authority figures but also as embodying superior knowledge based on western concepts of science and the liberal arts. These discourses are drawn from centuries of significations that produce teacher subjects as “expert authority” who embody the “truth” and normalize the hierarchal nature of disciplinary practices in schools.

As the interview with Erin continued, she described a specific incident when disciplinary techniques were used by teachers in the school. The school where Erin took AGC30 with me had a caricature of an Indigenous man as a school mascot. I taught a critique of Indigenous mascots in all of my classes, and as the school’s newspaper editor, Erin decided to write an article problematizing the mascot and suggesting it should be changed. In the following excerpt she recalled the reaction from the supervisor of the school newspaper, Mr. H.;

Erin: when you walk into a room and realize that everyone was just kind of talking about you, that feeling, and like everyone went silent that day that the issue came out. And I went to Mr. H who was the [school newspaper] supervising teacher and he said, “So your article has raised a lot of eyebrows in the staffroom.” And I remember thinking well

that's weird and awkward. So every time I saw teachers it would, I'd start to feel kind of uncomfortable because of it.

The disapproval of the staff regarding the newsletter cited by the words "raised eyebrows" discomforted and silenced Erin on the subject of dehumanizing mascots at that point in time. Erin was an Indigenous female who was an A+ student, involved in extra-curricular activities, and was performing the constructed notion of a "good student" through obedience to the system. As a white male supervisor of the school paper, Mr. H was in a position of authority over Erin and as such sought to regulate her actions. It was not until several years after graduation (outside the surveillance of her teachers) that Erin created a campaign to change the mascot. The silencing techniques that were used to regulate Erin into obedience when she questioned authority and white supremacy in her high school were a microcosm of the violent backlash she would eventually face from the community during the campaign against the mascot. In spite of this, the successful campaign resulted in the school (as well as two other schools on the prairies) banning racist mascots.

Sofie also shared a memory of being regulated by a teacher in the school. Sofie was tasked to visit each class during homeroom to distribute information about an event our class was organizing on the issue of poverty. Mr. C did not allow AGC30 students into his class during homeroom, even though homeroom was a time set aside for students to distribute information of upcoming school events. In the interview, Sofie and I discussed our shared memory of how she and a colleague returned to class upset from an exchange with Mr. C.

Sofie: So he was a figure in the school, everyone knew Mr. C and he was the Math teacher so everyone had to take a course from him at some point. Thank goodness I took

my Grade 12 Math online, I only say that because this whole citizenship program turned out to rub him the wrong way.

Mr. C was a white male math teacher who Sofie described as “a figure in the school” because he organized the male dominated sporting events which were highly valued in the school. Mr. C’s reaction was a vivid memory for Sofie because she had always performed the role of “good student” and was distraught when Mr. C made public his disapproval of a program she was involved in - as Sofie suggests, “it turned out to rub him the wrong way.” Drawing from critical race, feminist, and queer theories, the AGC30 course was an affront to the white patriarchal jock culture of the high school where Mr. C wielded power and authority. Rather than be treated like a “bad student” from a disapproving teacher with this kind of political status in the school, Sofie avoided taking classes with him. I can recall other incidents from teachers and administrators that students shared with me over the years: classes avoided, conversations silenced, behavior regulated, but because the majority of my students were white and middle class, they could navigate these tensions in a way that allowed them to maintain their status as “good students.”

In this excerpt Silas shared his memories of AGC30 and summarized his own perception of the course as well as how I fit onto the prescribed role of a teacher:

Silas: Well everybody would kind of hang out every morning together for a couple of hours, go on trips together and stuff and it would be a 3-hour tripAnd we’d have group projects every day. We’d sit at round tables so you’d get to talk and you weren’t dictating what we did very much, you’d obviously have to because you’re a

teacher but I mean if we got into a discussion or something you wouldn't be like "oh simmer down kids." It was good.

The authority I perform as a white cisgender teacher is prescribed by historical norms and societal and educational citations which construct teacher identity. As someone who tried to perform the role of facilitator, it is important to note Silas' choice of language and expectations when he says "you'd obviously have to [dictate] because you're a teacher." In spite of my desire to transgress practices of authority, Silas points out that I "didn't dictate that much" because I did not tell them to "simmer down" during class discussion. Although I attempted to negotiate these power dynamics, ultimately I had the authority to determine all boundaries extended to my students. This meant that the "freedoms" my students refer to in some of the interviews must be problematized in the co-production of teacher-student relationships as they are boundaries created and determined by me as the authority figure and which I could choose to arbitrarily change at any time. As a white teacher, my body is discursively marked as an example of "good teaching performance", and while transgressions are possible, they will be read and taken up by students within the context of teacher-student relations of power.

Normalizing Judgment: Making "Good" Students

Normalizing judgment is maintained through the use of constructed notions of normalcy which assess and compare individuals to the dominant construction. This section will analyze the co-construction of teacher-student performativity and how they are intelligible within the constitutions of what it means to be a "good teacher" and "good student." These discourses mark individuals in particular ways.

In the following excerpts, students responded to open-ended questions regarding AGC30

by constructing it as different than their “normal” classes. The binary the students used to discuss their perceptions of “normal” classes in relation to the AGC30 program primarily reflects two aspects of the course that were absent in other classes: 1) the incorporation of integrative antiracist content, and 2) the pedagogical practices which incorporated student centered inquiry research, co-operative learning, and experiential learning. To be clear, these were teaching initiatives my school board encouraged by implementing teacher trainings and resources with ongoing support for teachers to use in our everyday practices. It is important to consider whether some of these pedagogical practices can intervene in the disciplinary techniques analyzed in this chapter.

Jade: It was a really nice break from school, from like having to do the regular school things because I think that I was getting really sick of it and I wasn’t doing as well as I had in the past. So I thought that that was really nice. I got to take a break from the normal way of learning.

Jade uses words such as “break from school” and “normal way of learning” in the interview to indicate that her experience in AGC30 was different than her experiences in other courses. But these phrases are also citations of universal understandings of what school means. Jade does not have to explain in detail what a normal way of learning means as we are socialized into rational-technical practices of schooling and learning which include teacher centered lectures, textbook assignments, and exams. This indicates that we are socialized to accept certain practices as “normal.” It is important to note that while these practices have been challenged by research studies and progressive movements in education, teaching has remained relatively temporally and spatially static. For example, Austin was born and raised in the US and

attended AGC30 during his first year in Canadian schools. In spite of this, his responses did not differ from those given by students who attended school in Canada:

Austin: Give me a second to think on that one. Well it was a lot different than any other class I'd taken. You're given a lot more freedom to do the project how we want to do it instead of set and structured guidelines on how to do it. I think it would make it easier in some ways to slack off on the project, but if you're really committed to it on the other hand it gave you a lot more control over it, you got a lot more options on what you wanted to put in, how you wanted to present it. So in that way it was really nice and I enjoyed that part.

In this excerpt, Austin admits that this program was different than other classes he had taken, citing more freedom than the “structured guidelines” of other courses on choice of topics as well as projects, which were controlled by the teacher in other courses. Austin suggests that the lack of structured guidelines meant students could “slack off on a project” but that if they were committed to it they “had more control over it.” This language suggests that regular teaching practices control and limit the content and process students engage in, producing particular outcomes. This control of knowledge production has a significant impact on student subjectivity.

The binary construction of freedom versus structure was brought up several times by students, as Roxy states regarding AGC30:

I was allowed to be myself and have so much freedom and that I think inherently makes people more comfortable when they're not given a structured set of rules to adhere to or

expectations even. Like we had expectations but we could meet them in our own way, in our path.

There were many students that used language such as “comfortable” to describe their experience in the course which is important in terms of thinking about the space and pedagogy, because they did not use this language to describe the content which will be discussed further in Chapter 5. What is important to note is that students in high school are kept in a constant state of unease and tension, regulated by various rules and restrictions. What is the purpose of these rules and restrictions and what do they produce?

The Regulation and Production of Docile Bodies

All of the 16 participants stated that lecture and note taking were the most common teaching methods they experienced in high school. This is a process where teachers are produced as experts and students are treated as empty vessels to be filled with knowledge. Lecture and note taking is one example of the techniques that regulate the bodies of students in classrooms.

Kate: I didn't enjoy going to the other classes 'cause they were all sit there and you'd learn but you'd take notes so you wouldn't really be able to, you could only focus on the teacher, and that was the only kind of stimulus you had so when you were focusing for too long, you kind of drift off into your own little world.

Students sit in desks, face forward, and repetitiously write in silence, which is often used as the signification of student engagement. When Kate talks about “drifting off into her own little world” it is a reminder that students may resist in multiple and unseen ways. Although Kate admits to drifting off during class, her body was still being regulated. While she may not

have been actively listening, she performed the role of “good student” by remaining quietly at her seat in obedience to her teacher. The regulation of students’ bodies in desks and performance of repetitious tasks such as writing demonstrates how these conditions normalize compliance with hierarchal power relations and constructed notions of “good student.”

Over the years students in my courses often mentioned the significance of having couches in the classroom. Couches are viewed as a transgression to the formality of a classroom space—signifying the comfort of home, a visit with family or friends, and for some students resting;

Kara: It’s a very open environment, it just felt like a second home, you could nap on the couch, or you were supposed to be learning, or reading a book, but some of us would be napping. I remember all the documentaries that we watched, that was really cool, and the books.

The rational technical model of teaching means that teachers appear to be in control of the bodies of the students they teach at all times. How would most educators (or the general public) respond to the idea that students napped on couches during class time? How is this different than the excerpt where Kate “drifts off into her own world” during a lecture and note taking exercise in class? I would suggest the difference is that the teacher lecturing in the course Kate described appeared to maintain control over Kate’s body and how it performed. Students napping on my couch meant that I no longer had control over them which marked me as a *bad teacher*.

In the following excerpt, Noah discusses his memory of the first months of class when I would ask students their opinions on particular subjects. Noah suggests, like many of the other

students suggested in the interviews, that their opinion was not asked for or required in *normal* classrooms.

Noah: It was their first experience with this kind of, being presented with this kind of issue I suppose, and they were so unused to being asked their opinion, it was hilarious ‘cause you’d say: Well what do you think? I don’t know. What do you mean you don’t know? Yes you do. And then they’d think; well I actually think this. See that wasn’t that hard you just have to . . . they’re just not used to being asked.

Noah’s sarcasm was reflected in language such as “it was hilarious” - that students were not accustomed to being asked their opinions. It is also significant to note Noah’s choice of language when students stated they did not have an opinion. He suggested that I responded with “yes you do.” It is unclear to me whether he was suggesting I actually said “See that wasn’t that hard” to my students or if he is sharing his own thoughts regarding these memories. But forcing an opinion from students does not intervene in the hierarchal teacher-student relationship. Noah ended this episode of the conversation by stating “they’re just not used to being asked,” which suggests the co-production of teacher-student dynamics in schools generally do not require students to have or share opinions, but to quietly conform.

Students often noted that they could quickly *read* teachers and responded in the interviews that they learned how to play the *game* of school;

Roxy: I knew exactly, within the first couple weeks you figure out what kind of person your teacher is, what they want, and then you mold your responses and your answers and your assignments to suit what they want and that gets you the highest mark. And it’s yeah, it’s like a jigsaw puzzle and I had it figured out. I honestly believe that about high

school that that's why I got good marks. Less 'cause I was like really expressing myself or the best I could do and more 'cause I had the puzzle solved.

This is important in two ways: it shows how students negotiated their performance based on the *reading* of the classroom teacher and context, producing the appearance of docile bodies who seemed to have some agency in this performance. It also shows how some students may have been subverting teacher authority by *playing a game* and *figuring out the puzzle* so that they could perform the role of a “good student.” Noah provided another example:

Noah: Yeah, and you learned to say what the teacher wants you to say. You have a format and your opinion just kinda twists 'cause it doesn't matter at the end of the day because the teacher actually, a lot of the time they don't care, they don't know how to care. So you fill out a paper that's your opinion, quote, unquote, you give it to the teacher, they put in red pen some mysterious number, so your opinion is graded, so your opinion is an 84%, so you're pretty much right on the topic.

The admission that many of my students made that they feigned engagement with classes through the bodily performance of submission means that this may have also occurred in the AGC30 program. The realization that students often performed “good student” behavior makes it impossible for me to assess how many students actually learned integrative antiracist theory in a deep and meaningful way and how many simply *played the game* or were regulated into submission through a reading of my own performance. This excerpt exemplified how, as teachers, we can never accurately assess or have insight into our students' learning experiences in our classes. What we *can* do is provide the conditions for the possibility of learning and unlearning.

Power/Knowledge and Textbooks

When students talked about schooling and learning, the use of textbooks came up in every interview. As a concept that was discussed frequently, it is significant to analyze how this may be used as a disciplinary technique. What does the use of a textbook for each subject, in each classroom, for every student produce? While there have been numerous educational critiques regarding how textbooks legitimate particular kinds of knowledge, if we take these interviews to be a microcosm of classrooms across Canada, textbooks continue to be used as the main source of knowledge production in classroom settings.

Kara: I feel like in high schools, for the most part you're pretty sheltered from these things. Just you're like OK here's your math textbook, here's your English homework that you're gonna write about something that really has no relevance to the world.

In this excerpt, Kara suggested that students were "sheltered" from global issues. The word sheltered indicates that the information students can access is limited by required resources such as textbooks. She went on to suggest that students were required to write about things that had "no relevance to the world" which raises the question of how the material in textbooks connects to the lives of students in high school.

Much like Noah's discussion earlier in this chapter about how teacher-centered pedagogy regulates student opinions, in this excerpt Jade suggested that student ideas are regulated by textbooks:

Jade: like the ability to just have our own ideas is huge because in a lot of ways in school they make it so that you can't have your own ideas, you can only have the ideas in that book and those are the right ideas. And when you're looking at English and history it's

scary that they're saying this is the only way to look at it and this is your idea now. Just to be able to form them ourselves based on what you teach us, I think that's really important.

In this excerpt Jade suggested that schools regulated student ideas by constructing the knowledge in books as “the right ideas” or “truths.” It is important to note the use of the word “scary” when Jade described the way English and history courses are taught from a particular standpoint that is legitimized as the only valid knowledge. This kind of conditioning seemed alarming to Jade who submitted that students should be able to form their own ideas. Many students discussed how AGC30 was a space to form their own ideas. This suggests that when students are engaged in educational theories which counter dominant discourses, they have access to alternative discursive practices which are experienced as a type of freedom.

In the next excerpt Viv gave an explanation of how AGC30 course material was different than courses which relied on textbooks:

Viv: It was different in the fact that we didn't, OK open your textbooks to page 82, we're gonna read about the American Revolution. We all got to research our own specific part that we were interested in and we taught each other which was so much better than reading a textbook and reading what they thought happened. We kinda got to put our own spin on things and we got to show each other what we were interested in and it kind of ultimately pulled out all the important parts of history and English that I sought.

In this excerpt Viv described the way co-operative learning worked in ACG30. Students created inquiry research projects individually or in pairs/groups and then taught it to the class. I was also part of this process and would share my research with them. It is significant to note Viv's words

“so much better than reading a textbook and reading what they thought happened.” I did not ask Viv who “they” were but this language suggests that Viv has some awareness that textbooks are written from a particular standpoint or positioning. When Viv states that “we got to put our own spin on things” she may have been explaining the multiple ways students were asked to share their research or that they were encouraged to provide a critical analysis in their work. The course work positioned our research within a colonial context and in return my students and I learned a vast amount of information on specific practices and possible interventions.

In the following excerpt, Kate offered a similar perspective to Viv’s regarding how knowledge was produced in the course:

Kate: Because it was just like you were getting your education from a bunch of different sources, whether it’s your own research, or the teacher, or the other students who are part of the discussion, or you go to a lecture somewhere outside of school, and you’re getting that. And you’re learning a lot more, or you’re given more opportunity to teach yourself what you want to know about something because there’s a lot more flexibility.

One important aspect of the course was an experiential learning component that included class trips to various places within close proximity to the city such as art exhibits, guest speakers, films, or community events that were connected to social and environmental justice issues. These trips created another form of learning that was not available to most classes, as Gabi states: “I didn’t feel like we had to do so many make work projects and stupid book reports, and things like that that weren’t really helping anybody learn.” The use of the words “make work projects” is an important choice of language as Gabi indicated that the series of assignments students were asked to complete seemed to be designed just to keep students busy, rather than

being connected to their learning. I can recall in particular that over the years my students would often complain to me that they “weren’t learning anything” in school. I will examine these discourses further in the final analysis of this study.

In this excerpt, Jade compares her “normal” history courses to AGC30 and mentions the use of textbooks:

Jade: The History class was straight from the textbook

Sheelah: How would you describe more about who it focused on?

Jade: Well like the colonists more than anything. There was usually a chapter or a page, or two about minority groups in every chapter of the textbook, I guess. And most of it would be like British or whatever, the group of majority, and there’d be a little blip on minority groups.

The textbooks used in public schools on subjects such as English and history are constituted by and constitutive of the language and ideologies of white settler colonialism and schools are one of the spaces where these practices are normalized and reproduced for the masses (Stanley, 2006). As Montgomery (2005) suggests;

School textbook histories of the nation may not set out to teach about “race” or to perpetuate state racisms; nevertheless, their nationalist narratives contribute to racisms by representing the nation-state, its citizens and its internal and external Others in essentialist and narrowly imagined terms, by excluding the perspectives and histories of certain people and groups, by ignoring the reality of historical racisms and the multiple forms of oppression to them. (p. 317)

Jade explains that the content in the textbook focused on “the colonists” or the “British” while the histories of minority groups were marginalized to “a page or two.” As Jade describes it, they encompassed “a little blip.” The disciplines are constructed as official knowledge and as such constitute the dominant discourses that are legitimized by government, media, libraries, and other institutions. The erasure of the histories of Indigenous peoples, people of color, and women from textbooks can be understood as the discourse of silence (Foucault, 1990) which will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

In the following excerpt Erin discusses why she decided to collect Canadian history textbooks:

Erin: One of my hobbies now is actually collecting old Canadian history textbooks that were used in high schools and elementary schools even and going through them and seeing all of the just the ridiculous things that are said.

Sheelah: About?

Erin: Generally First Nations people Yeah, just the, the manifest destiny world view that is always portrayed in history textbooks . . . Even today, if you look in University, like Canadian history textbooks, there’s always that sense of manifest destiny. Like it’s we’re all expected to be part of the culture of the colonizer when we’re not, so yeah.

That history always will fascinate me just because of how, how easily it can be skewed to exclude and oppress entire groups of people.

Erin continued to analyze colonial discourses in educational textbooks, in particular the impact this has had on Indigenous peoples and territories. Erin used the word “ridiculous” to describe the content in the textbooks she had collected and suggested that the “manifest destiny

worldview” of white settler colonialism is “always portrayed” or a dominant discourse in history textbooks. As Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill (2013) contend, “Manifest destiny, somewhat after the facts, became the explanation for the atrocities of settler colonialism, more for those who benefit/ed by settler colonialism so that they might more easily stomach their own complicity in ongoing colonization” (p. 26). Erin argued that this narrative has been consistent and can be found in textbooks today, including textbooks for university courses. Erin went on to say that the colonial state worked to assimilate Indigenous people into the dominant culture, or as she states, “part of the culture of the colonizer.” Erin’s final comment in regards to her interest in continuing to learn about how national narratives in history textbooks are used to subjugate entire groups of people, provides an example of how integrative antiracist pedagogy can invite students to think about how discursive practices produce relations of power (Butler, 1997).

The Examination

According to Foucault (1995) the examination, “combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of normalizing judgment” (p. 184). The mechanisms of examination are a normalizing gaze which acts as a surveillance mechanism that can “qualify, classify and punish” individuals in order to judge and differentiate between them (Foucault, 1995, p. 184). Like normalizing judgment, examinations use constructions of normality to assess individuals, but also have the authority of *testing* which legitimizes constructed value systems regarding an individual’s intelligence or capacity. Foucault (1995) argues that of all the mechanisms of discipline, the examination is highly ritualized because it is a combination of “ceremony of power,” “deployment of force,” and an “establishment of truth” (p. 184). It is a mechanism of power relations that makes it possible to extract and constitute knowledge in the same moment.

In the following excerpt, Jade describes exams as part of “normal” school:

Sheelah: So that’s normal school for you?

Jade: Yes.

Sheelah: Is regurgitation

Jade: Yeah.

Sheelah: And you find that what? Like how would you describe your feelings about that kind of school?

Jade: Well really I’m good at it, like I was good at writing tests and stuff like that. So it worked for me but I know a lot of people who it didn’t work for and in a lot of ways, I mean it’s boring because you don’t actually learn that much and you forget it after you do it because it’s words that are packed, and they are not ideas at all. And so I mean when you forget everything that you’re learning in school, what’s the point? And I started to feel that way by like Grade 11. I was doing a lot worse in school. I was still getting good marks but not what I knew I was capable of just because I was bored.

Jade suggested that examinations were boring because “you don’t learn that much and you forget it after you do it” which was a reoccurring statement made to me by the students regarding examinations. I did not ask Jade what she meant when she said examinations only test “words that are packed” instead of ideas. However many students discussed their frustration with memorization and regurgitation, as Sam suggested in her interview; “You’re not learning, this is what happened, this is why it happened - it’s here’s a test, regurgitate it, forget it.” While students may forget the details—names, dates etc., the repetition of these practices over extensive periods of time normalizes submission to authority as well as what constitutes

knowledge, and this regulates what it means to be a good student in particular ways. Students are individualized and classified based on the marks they get which becomes part of their identity as a student.

In the following excerpt, Viv talks about her experience in AGC30 where student assessment was based on projects, portfolios, and student-teacher interviews:

Sheelah: How did you feel about not having exams?

Viv: I loved it.

Sheelah: Really?

Viv: And not just because you don't have to study for a test the day before, but you don't have that pressure to memorize and then forget it the next day. It's always with you now and it's not a fact that you just regurgitate, which was relief for me. And I'm a person who does like exams, I like knowing where I'm sitting at and how I'm doing, but in that class I don't think it really should apply.

Viv suggested in the excerpt that while she was relieved to avoid the pressure of memorizing for exams in AGC30, she was a person who liked exams; "I like knowing where I'm sitting at and how I'm doing." This indicates that Viv accepted how exams classified her as a particular kind of learner, especially when high grades marked her as a "good student." Viv remarked that she thought exams should not apply in a course like AGC30, and I did not ask her to clarify what that meant to her. In my experiences of teaching, it is clear that teaching and learning integrative antiracism is a process which is difficult to assess through examinations and grades and it is possible that this is why Viv stated that it should not apply to courses such as AGC30.

In the following excerpt Nova explains that AGC30 was different from her other courses:

“I think a lot of it was there’s no competition in that class. I mean a lot of it came from no marks and stuff like that, we all had to work together on certain projects.” In AGC30 students were assessed through feedback on individual and group projects, but were not given grades until the teacher-student negotiated mark on their mid-term and final portfolio during the student-teacher interview. According to Nova this type of assessment, as well as the co-operative learning practices, disrupted the competition between her and her colleagues which is produced by the classification of students through grades. As this student participant suggests:

Roxy: Yeah, and it helped me build so much more confidence in my work and my ability ’cause it wasn’t like I was, yeah again it wasn’t like I was doing this for the grade, I wasn’t writing or discussing or anything for the grade in the way that I knew I had to get the highest mark possible. I was doing it in the way that I thought was best and the way that I would choose to do it.

Sheelah: So that builds confidence?

Roxy: Yeah exactly ’cause before I would think “I could say this but if I say that the teacher won’t like it and I’ll get a lower grade” right. So it’s like, oh ok I can do this how I think is best, and it’s good, it totally builds confidence in your voice.

Almost all of the students discussed a connection between various pedagogical practices as either building or inhibiting their confidence. This was a word that was used repeatedly, and like Roxy, many students were able to articulate why they experienced confidence in a class. According to Roxy, examinations and grades regulated student responses and inhibited them from building confidence as learners, researchers, and writers. This is significant for analyzing the regulation of docile bodies;

Sam: because then you're interested in what you're learning instead of, you know preparing for the test that's coming, it's learning for your own benefit I feel like. And you can take as much as you want from the course you can take it above and beyond if you'd like to.

Sam suggested that our class inquiry projects allowed students to create research based on interest rather than “preparing for a test.” Sam also said that she felt like she could take the course “above and beyond” and I recall that many of my students exceeded the criteria we co-created as a class for assignments. It is important to note that much like grades, written feedback is simply another form of assessment. While moving away from grading may disrupt some things (as a technique to classify), it does not intervene in the authority of the teacher or the disciplinary technique of assessment practices. My students looked to me for approval in everything they created, including non-verbal cues such as a smile or a nodding head. This research study is a reminder to me as a teacher that we cannot position ourselves outside of this authority. In terms of disciplinary techniques, Foucault (1995) suggests that the examination is the superimposition of power relations and knowledge relations—“its rituals, its methods, its characters and their roles, its play of questions and answers, its systems of marking and classification” can be understood as an entire domain of knowledge and power (p. 185).

Panopticism: Bodies and Spaces

The idea of the panopticon is taken from Bentham's idea of an ideal prison (Foucault, 1995) which includes a cylinder building in which the prisoners are isolated from each other yet in constant view from the guards' watch tower. Prisoners are watched continually but do not know when they are being observed which creates an atmosphere of constant surveillance.

Foucault compares the technique of the panopticon to classroom structures where the teacher can view students from the front of the classroom and students are isolated from each other by desks situated in rows. Foucault argues that the distribution of bodies in space—arranging, separating, and isolating—contributes to the function of disciplinary power in the co-production of teacher-student relations of power. This distribution can be understood as productive rather than repressive, existing in action, and functioning at the level of the body.

Overwhelmingly, the typical classroom set up is an arrangement of desks in rows with the teacher's desk positioned at the front of the room. One only has to walk through a school in any urban or rural setting to witness that there are few variances to this model. I worked with different configurations of desks in my first years of teaching (square pods of four facing each other, circles of five to six desks, etc.), and moved to working with tables and couches for the better part of my career. In the following excerpts, students compare their experiences with spaces in a typical classroom setting to AGC30:

Viv: it was sad when it all ended, it's like a family breaking apart.

Sheelah: Why do you think that was?

Viv: I think just how we were learning and how we all interacted every day for so long together. And just even the way that we were set up in the classroom where it wasn't traditional in a row. We were in tables so you got to talk to people and you got to interact with one another, which I think really brought everyone together.

In this excerpt, Viv suggested that students built relationships with each other in AGC30 because of the distribution of time and space. The integrative course ran for a half day for 4 months. The regular time table for students in schools involves subject specific disciplines

divided into 1-hour classes, and anything that varies from this timetable is called an “alternative” schedule, normalizing this distribution and segregation of disciplines/time/bodies. Viv suggested that how they were learning and interacting each day with one another, “really brought everyone together.” This is significant for understanding what desks in rows and segregated time tables produce in terms of individualizing and isolating students from each other. As Kate states: “Yeah, everything was kind of group work because we had the tables, we all were facing each other.” What does it do to relations of power in a classroom for students to face each other, rather than facing the teacher?

Abby: I think forming that community in the classroom is another really important thing that you do. And I don’t think that you do it intentionally, well I mean maybe you do, I have no idea. It’s that we’re able to form that community and talk so comfortably. I think that you get that in elementary school, a lot of kids are pretty comfortable with each other by the time, but in high school you go from place to place and never really feel comfortable saying what you, I think for a lot of kids they never really feel comfortable saying what they need to say or what they want to say. I think it’s really important that you have at least one class where you can form a community and feel really comfortable with everybody. I think it’s important that it’s longer as well.

Like Viv, Abby suggested that the course created a community and a space where students were able to talk comfortably with one another. The distribution of time, space, and bodies in high schools creates the isolation and discomfort that produces docile bodies. As Abby suggested, “kids never really feel comfortable saying what they need to say or what they want to say.” One of the markings of a “good teacher” is a quiet classroom with well disciplined

students which is more difficult to perform with table groups and couches. Negotiating this as a teacher can also be discomforting. As a white cisgender women with a Masters in Education, these minor alterations were often celebrated/tolerated by the school board as an “alternative” form of education. Providing one course allows institutions to appear progressive without having to make structural and necessary changes in the organization of schools, curriculum, or teacher training.

Like Viv and Abby, Kara also felt that her and her classmates built close relationships with each other in AGC30. During our interview, I asked her if some of the projects we were involved in outside of the school campus may have contributed to the environment of relationship building:

Sheelah: And you did big projects together outside of school where I think you developed different relationships maybe doing that?

Kara: Yeah, people are kind of different in a classroom setting than they are when you’re outside of class, but not to the point where it’s a completely different person but you get a new perspective of them.

Kara indicated that students (and teachers) may act differently inside of schools than when they are in other spaces, “not to the point where it’s a completely different person,” but where they may perform differently. This suggests that there are particular normative ways of *being* in a school setting, whereas other spaces may invite a more complex set of performances and relationships. It is important, however, to analyze how schooling may normalize particular kinds of performances in other institutional settings and public spaces as well, so that “good student” and “good citizen” are both marked by submission to authority as well as what constitutes well-

disciplined behavior. As Foucault (1995) states; “The Panopticon is a marvelous machine which, whatever use one may wish to put to it, produces homogenous effects of power” (p. 202). The constellations that produce goodness will be explored further in this research study.

It is important to note that in most school systems, shifts in classroom programming in terms of time and space are created primarily for students who are segregated in particular ways and marked as requiring an *alternative* school experience. Sometimes this includes students whom are marginalized in the system, but more often students who excel in academics receive these kinds of course options. In our school system these programs included International Baccalaureate programs, outdoor environmental programs, media school, as well as science and athletics programs. These special programs were viewed as necessary, while the vast majority of mainstream students continued to be regulated by spatial and temporal disciplinary measures described in this chapter.

Surveillance/Self-Surveillance

The notion of surveillance discussed in this section is a central aspect of all the disciplinary techniques described above. To be effective, Foucault suggests that disciplinary techniques function as regulating mechanisms, so that even in the absence of authority, subjects continue to perform in particular ways (Foucault, 1995). As Youdell (2006a) states,

This gives rise to the ‘self-surveillance’ of the observed, examined and judged ‘individual’ whose activity is controlled and who is distributed across functional sites—the student acts the good student, the teacher acts the good teacher, the school acts the good school as accountability mechanisms render all visible and open to assessment and correction. (p. 36)

When the authority figure is no longer visible, subjects engage in controlling habits and value sustaining self-images. During the interviews, several students discussed their self-reflections regarding learning in AGC30. Each of these examples show some awareness that schooling becomes “a part of who we are”:

Noah: In a conventional classroom setting someone could say what did you learn? And if you learned very well you could just sit down and say I learned topic A in this capacity, topic B in this capacity, I learned about Macbeth, I got a 75 on it, like you can just walk down a sheet, whereas that’s not actual learning, that’s all regurgitation because you can just puke out what you learned back onto a piece of paper and then get a nice red number on it. But then in an integrative class if you’re actually learning, it shouldn’t be just something burning at the top of your head saying you’ve learned this, this, and this. It just becomes part of who you are, you just know things, you’ve learned as opposed to just branded with information.

In this excerpt, Noah suggested that regurgitation or “puke out what you learned back onto a piece of paper” is not real learning. Noah states that this type of learning does not impact who students are and contends that in an integrative course like AGC30, if you are “*actually learning*” you cannot list the things you have learned, but rather “It just becomes part of who you are, you just know things, you’ve learned as opposed to just branded with information.” What this research shows is that schooling produces particular kinds of subjects, however the effects of the rational technical teaching that Noah described at the beginning of this excerpt are so normalized as to seem imperceptible. It is these systems of power embedded in pedagogy that this research seeks to illuminate. The use of the words “branded with information” is significant

in this context as it speaks to the industrialized model of mass produced power/knowledge and subject formation in a colonial institution.

Gabi: I think that a class like this is interesting because it comes at a time where you're forming so many opinions about yourself in the world that I think it's a good time to be talking about all of that. Sometimes when I think about the way that I think about things I can actually pinpoint some of the reasons why I think about them and it comes from our class. We were in Grade 12 when we took it and so you're just becoming an adult, and you're just becoming a legitimate part of your community and I think I definitely started to think about that in a different way. And yeah, just I think generally forming my own opinion about the kind of person that I wanted to be and the kind of place that I wanted to have in the world.

In this excerpt, Gabi talked about why high school was a significant time to learn integrative antiracism, in particular because students were "forming so many opinions about yourself in the world." Gabi suggested that she could connect how she thought about particular things back to the theories we were exploring in AGC30 and that this was an important aspect of "forming her own opinions about the kind of person" that she wanted to be. In theories of subject formation, Foucault (1995) contends that when subjects have access to a wide spectrum of discourses, shifts in how one thinks about and performs their own subjectivity can occur. The pervasiveness of discourses that reify whiteness in public schools means that norms limit how teachers and students can think about and perform our own identity. As Erin contends in the following excerpt:

Erin: I wish that I could go back and start at Grade 1 and see all of the things we were taught and all of the ideas that were put into my head about everything, gender, First Nations people, poverty and class structure. I wish that I could go back with the analysis that I have now . . . and you don't even have to go back in time. You can just go and look at a textbook or go sit in a class and see the same kind of things being perpetuated today.

In this excerpt, Erin wanted to go back through her schooling to investigate what discourses were available to her and realized that she could investigate those discourses by searching through textbooks or sitting in classrooms today, because the context of white heteropatriarchy continues to be reified in classrooms across the Canadian state.

Conclusion

The analysis of excerpts from student interviews in this chapter provides examples of how the repetition of disciplinary routines modify conduct and govern practices. In particular, pedagogy is a relation of power between the student and teacher that is not easily disrupted, as it draws on historically discursive practices of who has knowledge and the authority to speak. This chapter shows how I used teaching practices with the intention of disrupting the disciplinary techniques of schooling and the constitution of the teacher/student binary relationship. The analysis of student discourses suggests that these alternatives did little to shift these dynamics. It is the constellations of devices such as observation, normalizing judgment, and surveillance which work to regulate how students are produced and perform themselves as subjects.

Overwhelmingly, teachers and administrators are produced as white, middle class, and straight. These power relations normalize and naturalize the hierarchal racial, gender, and sexual

formations of white settler colonialism in a context of mass education in K-12 public schools (Kumashiro, 2000; Leonardo, 2009; St. Denis & Schick, 2003). Foucault contends that while the original intent may have been to implement an enlightened system which produces more “responsible citizens,” what educational institutions provide instead is the techniques for social control. According to Foucault (1995), there was little concern for how individuals responded to these processes as long as the end result is conformity.

Chapter 6: Canadian Nationalism and Racial Formations

After an educational leave to complete my Master's in integrative antiracism, I was moved to a high school where the new principal decided to implement the singing of the national anthem every morning. His justification to the staff was that the school atmosphere needed to be more formal in order to instill "discipline" in the students. Every morning, students and teachers were forced to awkwardly stand at attention and sing O Canada in their classroom. Annoyed by this, I told my students it was their choice to stand or not stand, and I sat at my desk while the music played each day. Obediently, the students followed my lead . . . except for one young man who stood once a week out of duty to a higher authority, all semester long.

This chapter will examine the student excerpts under the theme The Canadian Identity, and coded for discussions on nationalism and race. One of the goals of teaching the AGC30 course was to "make visible" the historical and ongoing mechanisms of white settler colonialism such as white supremacy and heteropatriarchy, and provide a critical analysis. Understanding subjects as being subjectivated through discourse suggests that disrupting these discourses may mean that subjects perform differently (Butler, 1997). As Warren (2001a) suggests, "Whiteness, while a systemic historical process that is diffuse and abstract, is also located through embodiment – through a repetition of mundane and extraordinary acts that continually make and remake whiteness, all while eluding scrutiny and detection" (p. 91). This means that the everyday talk of white settler subjects can be analyzed in order to understand how whiteness is reproduced through social interaction.

Foucault contends that while a sovereign society once sought to defend itself from

external attacks, the focus in modernity is on its internal enemies (Stoler, 1995). Stoler (1995) suggests that the “discourses of sexuality, racial thinking and rhetoric of nationalism have several things in common”: all three are produced through the notion that external markers are indications of internal traits and moral essence (p. 134). These social taxonomies were institutionalized and inscribed onto bodies through nation building practices.

Both Rankin (2000) and Nagel (2000) contend that the project of nation building in Canada is produced by a legacy of white masculinist practices that have been preserved as integral to the survival of the nation. The pillars of colonial empire such as “state power, citizenship, nationalism, militarism – are at best understood as masculinist projects” (Nagel, 2000, p. 243). These discourses have produced multiple practices of institutionalized white heteropatriarchy including citizenship laws, family and marriage laws, and the regulation of land ownership.

This chapter will analyze student excerpts in order to examine how whiteness is accomplished through the discursive practices of race and nationhood. The analysis from this chapter will suggest that the white students continued to perform whiteness as they described their learning in a course focused on integrative antiracism. The students’ management of language is a form of self-surveillance that reproduces their position as citizen-subjects. In constituting themselves as both innocent and superior, students embody the discursive practices of the benevolent white settler state.

This chapter is organized into two sections: Part I: *The Regulation of Nationalist Discourses in Public Schools* will provide examples of some of the assignments for the course and analyze four major themes that students discussed in the interviews. These themes are: i)

Proud to be Canadian, ii) *Multiculturalism as a state narrative*, iii) *Meritocracy and whiteness*, and iv) *Our home on Native land*. The purpose of the course assignments was to challenge the logics of white settler colonialism with a goal of intervening in white heteronormative subject making practices. Each of the excerpts chosen from the data are examples of the discourses which legitimize white settler colonialism and maintain white supremacy, although in variant ways.

Part II: *Disrupting nationalist discourses: On being good, feeling good* examines the emotional investments students had in innocence and how this was disrupted when they learned about our complicity in systems of oppression. This chapter will show how teaching about national identity can be a useful site through which to examine processes of subject formation and explores some of the ways in which whiteness is reconstituted through the management of integrative anti-racist language.

Part I: The Regulation of Nationalist Discourses in Public Schools

The initial questions that were posed in the interviews were open ended questions regarding the students' most prominent memories from the course. Each student spoke about Canadian identity without prompting which made it an important theme from the data. This theme most likely arose frequently in the data because the course included ongoing research, written assignments, and creative projects investigating the policies and practices that legitimize and reproduce white settler colonialism.

The purpose of integrative antiracist education is to examine the various practices that produce and maintain social hierarchies in order to disrupt them. As Mackey (2002) suggests; "It is only through problematizing dominant categories—which are often invisible and yet

powerfully normative—that we can begin to understand how they are invented and reproduced” (p. 3). Foucault (1980) contends that these discourses act as “regimes of truth” that a society accepts and “makes function as true” (p. 131). The various culturally-sanctioned discourses that will be analyzed in this chapter are not original—they are already “common sense notions” and available forms of asserting dominance and evading complicity (Applebaum, 2004).

There are several key assignments from the AGC30 course that I created to provide students with examples of how social hierarchies have been created and maintained through the practices of white settler colonialism. For example, one of the first creative writing pieces I assigned students in the course was to write a 2 to 3 page paper which answered the question, *What is the Canadian Identity?* In this assignment, students were asked to describe what they knew about the Canadian national identity and social/political culture. After reading through the assignments, I compiled a summary of the common narratives to share back with the students. In each of the classes, the discourses students drew from constructed the nation and its citizens as democratic, tolerant, and multicultural, with a reputation for peacekeeping worldwide.

A significant amount of time was spent in the remainder of the course providing specific examples that challenged these national narratives. The purpose of this assignment was to show students how national discourses maintain notions of state benevolence and how we as citizen-subjects come to embody and perform a national identity of the “good” citizen-subject. The excerpts that I have chosen for this chapter are recognizable discourses in a colonial context and were explored in various ways throughout our AGC30 program.

Proud to be Canadian. The phrase “*proud to be Canadian*” in this first excerpt is a patriotic idiom that can be found both in government rhetoric and popular culture such as

advertising on t-shirts and other items. Nationalist discourses obscure the social and political context of white heteropatriarchy and legitimate the mechanisms that maintain white settler colonialism. Performances of national pride are familiar cultural signs that are produced through discourses of settler exceptionalism. What does it mean to be proud to be Canadian in a colonial context? In this first excerpt, Roxy is responding to our conversation regarding how the AGC30 course worked to challenge nationalist discourses:

Roxy: And that's something I still think about 'cause there's this weird little spark in me that still, it feels like, "oh I'm proud to be a Canadian, but maybe I should look at that."

Is that totally brainwashing? I don't know. But I think that a lot of the reason that we cover it up so much is 'cause it just goes so completely against this ideal Canadian that we've built up. Germany's embraced that they have to confront this head on whereas we still – "Canada is multicultural and Canada is accepting and Canada's one of the safest places in the world to live and we have a high standard of life and everybody here is really, really nice" Yeah, just that real struggle with should I be proud to be Canadian? That was huge.

In this excerpt Roxy seemed discomforted by her desires for national pride, referring to it as a "weird spark." She acknowledged that the Canadian state was built on the genocide of Indigenous people when she compared Canada to Germany, a country that has "embraced that they have to confront this head on," while we "cover it up." In a colonial context, national pride exalts white subjects as having earned citizenship through superior morals and initiative rather than systemic violence and inequality (Thobani, 2007). Nationalist discourses such as "proud to be Canadian" connect white bodies to vast geographical spaces through a celebration of the

imaginary nation. White subjects' sense of belonging to a particular land and disparate people maintains the legitimacy of the colonial state and justifies white domination (McLean, 2013; Thobani, 2007). White settler subjects such as Roxy are subjectivated by nationalist discourses that reproduce whiteness as benevolence.

Roxy suggested that her resistance to giving up national pride can be attributed to “brainwashing” as well as belief systems that are “strongly ingrained.” This choice of language denies Roxy’s agency, attributing the tensions she feels to social conditioning rather than the protection of her innocence as a white female citizen-subject. As boundary makers for the nation–state, white women are produced through discourses of sexual virtue and moral superiority (McClintock, 1995; Stoler, 1995). Roxy’s personification of the state when she explains that “Canada” is perceived as “really really nice” exemplifies the ways in which white subjects come to embody and uphold these national narratives.

Even after Roxy problematized what she knew about the violence involved in nation building, she suggested that questioning nationalism was a difficult task for her, “should I be proud to be Canadian? That was huge.” Questioning national pride is experienced as “huge” by Roxy because it challenges the discourses that mark both the nation and the citizen-subject as innocent of the violence required to maintain colonialism and inequitable conditions (Leonardo, 2009; Mackey, 2002). The rhetoric and rituals of nationalism reproduce the logics that uphold the white settler state.

Multiculturalism as a state narrative. Liberal multiculturalism as a national narrative and source of Canadian pride is evident in curriculum and textbooks, institutional policies, and tropes throughout school systems and other institutions across Canada (Dhamoon, 2009; Ng,

1993; Thobani, 2007). Much like other moves to innocence, multiculturalism is a discursive frame which marks the nation and nationals as “tolerant” and “inclusive” (Mackey, 2002). In Canada, multiculturalism began as a political strategy in order to address concerns regarding competing language, culture, and land claims (St. Denis, 2011). The narrative of multiculturalism subverts the racist practices of white supremacy which are the foundation of nation building and position Indigenous nations problematically as a part of the state mosaic (St. Denis, 2011). These discourses regulate the racialized, gendered, and heteronormative meanings of the “model minority” which are defined by state practices of citizenship (Dhamoon, 2009).

For example, women applying for immigrant status are classified into “independent class” or “family class.” This system disadvantages married women who are assumed to be dependent on their husbands for livelihood when they may have more education or job training (Ng, 1993). These kinds of discriminatory practices continue through the current immigration policies and border control (Dhamoon, 2009; Walia, 2014). The way that schools and other institutions across Canada celebrate diversity and multiculturalism normalizes discourses of *difference* rather than challenging how social and political power is distributed in racist, sexist, and inequitable ways.

In order to challenge the dominant discourses of Canadian tolerance and liberal multiculturalism, students in AGC30 were required to do individual and/or group research projects on colonial state practices and subject formation. The projects included a paper and class presentation on topics such as how particular groups were constructed in mass media and textbooks, as well as government policies that reproduced racialized, gendered, and sexualized inequalities. Many students, for example, chose to research immigration laws over a period of

time in order to understand how state discourses and policies shift, depending on the economic needs of the state.

The theoretical framework for these initial assignments were supported through films, readings, lectures, and discussions that provided the foundation for our ongoing examination of the differential ways we are positioned in a colonial context. St. Denis and Schick (2003) call this a pedagogy of “counter histories” which includes teaching specific historical and contemporary examples of how identity categories are socially produced and naturalized (p. 60). In the following excerpt, Noah recalls learning about multiculturalism in elementary school:

You’re brought up in grade school and everyone teaches you “well Canada’s a great nation, it’s multicultural, we’re this great mosaic, and we have representatives from all these cultures who we accept as equals and as brothers and sisters’ and blah, blah, blah, blah.” We sound like a very good place in elementary school, and then you start looking back and it’s not exactly like that. And does that mean we can’t be or we’re not a great country? No, it just means we have to be a little more humble about how good we are to different cultures.

In this excerpt Noah suggested that in public schools multiculturalism is equated with “equality” and “acceptance as brothers and sisters,” or as Schick and St. Denis (2005) contend, “multiculturalism is enacted as a symbol of the ‘good’ nation” (p. 296). Noah’s language choice and tone in this excerpt, in particular his use of the phrase “blah blah blah blah,” can be read as a form of mocking or criticism towards teachers who legitimize liberal multiculturalism. This positioning of himself as more knowledgeable or more progressive is one way that white subjects such as Noah can maintain superiority as we learn about our own complicity in systems of

inequality and oppression (Schick, 2000a; Thompson, 2003).

Noah states that “We sound like a very good place in elementary school, and then you start looking back and it’s not exactly like that.” The use of the phrase “not exactly” is an evasion that qualifies Noah’s initial questioning of multiculturalism. Noah’s repetition of the plural designation of “we” clearly positions him as a citizen-subject of the nation-state and part of the dominant group who “names” or constitutes Others (Butler, 1993). As a white cis male, Noah’s subjection through nationalist discourses exalts him as a symbol of the nation-state. In the final sentence, Noah embodied state paternalism when he suggested that we were still a great country that simply required some humility regarding how “good” we have been to other “cultures.” These excerpts are an example of how dominant subjects manage language ways that question national narratives such as multiculturalism while reifying whiteness. This positioning as an insider/outsider of the colonial state is common in student interviews.

Cultural difference. One of the effects of discourses of multiculturalism is the focus on cultural difference. In her research of public school curriculum in British Columbia, McDonald (2006) suggests that the intensified transnational flow of people and capital has been used to produce notions of difference and create racial boundaries, as students from diverse diasporic experiences are cast as outsiders from the Canadian state. Thobani (2007) states that bodies racialized as “immigrant” are constructed as importing exoticized cultural practices, exaggerating the differences between nationals and “outsiders,” while the commonalities between these groups are erased. These discourses produce racialized groups that have unequal access to social and political power, yet the problem of racialized practices are often located in “cultural differences” with the only possible solution being to understand and celebrate diverse

cultures (Dhamoon, 2009; Mackey, 2002; St. Denis, 2011). For example, in the following excerpt, Kara goes on to talk about immigration and cultural differences;

So I mean, yeah, our culture is really a fast paced culture and so all these new immigrants are coming in and working these minimum wage jobs and they're just trying to survive and then all these people are just constantly shitting on them all the time . . . it's just like we want them to absorb our culture, which is cultureless. I don't know, when I think Canadian culture, I don't think, I don't know, there's so many beautiful cultures out there and they're never reflected in Canada.

Kara drew from common cultural tropes that reify binaries of self/Other when she stated for example that “our culture is really fast paced,” which can be read as marking the Canadian state as civilized/industrialized in opposition to “third world countries” (Bhabba, 1994) which are constructed as backwards in comparison. The common phrase “all these new immigrants coming in” is racialized discourse that marks immigration as a threat to white hegemony. Kara seemed to suggest that immigrants face racial discrimination when she discussed immigrants working “minimum wage jobs” and “trying to survive,” however she did not name racism and systems of white supremacy. Instead, Kara both individualized and distanced herself from racism as she talked about “all these people shitting on them all the time.” In spite of her initial language suggesting inequality and discrimination, the remaining excerpt focused on explanations of cultural difference.

Kara continued on in the excerpt by suggesting that Canadians expect immigrants to assimilate into Canadian culture “which is cultureless,” a common narrative that conceals our British/white heteropatriarchal culture (Coleman, 2006). The discourses that center and

normalized dominant culture practices co-produce the “exotic” cultural practices of groups that are Othered (Dhamoon, 2009; Said, 2003). Kara advocated for multiculturalism when she submitted that “beautiful cultures are not reflected in Canada.” Although Kara began the excerpt talking about racial discrimination, she ended by suggesting that the problem is the lack of inclusion of beautiful cultures.

One of the goals of the AGC30 course each year is to analyze and disrupt the discourses of multiculturalism and cultural difference by teaching about identity construction and the historical context of colonialism and nation-building (Dhamoon, 2009; St. Denis, 2004, 2011). Multicultural policies reproduce essentialized differences through the fetishization of cultural practices, reinforcing the notion that inequity is caused by cultural differences, rather than racist state practices. As well, current multicultural education practices often approach inequality with an “add and stir” dimension which suggests that by simply including knowledge about culture, educational systems can disrupt institutional and systemic racism (Kumashiro, 2000). The discourses of multiculturalism assume monolithic group identities, silencing issues that are contextual and emplaced, and ignoring how individuals may be positioned differently within a racialized group (McDonald, 2006).

While students remember that multiculturalism is a nationalist narrative that we challenged in the course, they continue to draw from dominant discourses that positioned them as both superior to other whites who were less progressive or racist and innocent of dominance required to maintain inequality. These performances of whiteness are significant in that they highlight that either students did not understand some of the materials in the course or that this was a type of resistance that allowed them to maintain aspects of their identity as they negotiated

discourses that challenged who they are.

Meritocracy and whiteness. Meritocracy as a dominant liberal discourse suggests that people succeed through individual merit such as hard work and intelligence. In Canada and other industrialized countries there are many narratives that produce common sense notions of equal opportunity. The discourses of meritocracy construct the nation-state as having unlimited resources and opportunity and that to succeed an individual only has to work hard. Any lack of success is then evidence of low morals and lack of work ethic (Schick & St. Denis, 2005). Much like the discourses of nationalism and multiculturalism, the discourse of meritocracy obscures the ways in which inequality has been produced through racialized and gendered policies and practices.

In order to challenge the discourse of meritocracy, students are asked to complete a research project titled “Roots Assignment” where they interview family members and provide photos, artifacts, and archival research on their family history. Students are required to provide an analysis of how this research positions them within a colonial context and to be prepared to share their findings with the class. The student analysis for the Roots Assignment was supported through the films, articles, and stories that we engaged in daily as a class. I also provided students with some of the key concepts of identity construction through PowerPoint and discussion in order to support their understanding of how white settler subjectivities were produced in a Canadian context.

When dominant colonial discourses are disrupted through integrative antiracist pedagogy, there are various positions of innocence white settlers may shift towards. For example, St Denis and Schick (2003) investigate three popular ideological assumptions from the antiracism course

they taught to white pre-service teachers. The authors found three discursive moves that produce innocence and superiority such as colorblindness (race does not matter), meritocracy (everyone has equal opportunity), and finally that individual good intentions can secure innocence (pp. 61–65). In the following excerpt, Silas talks about his family’s immigration from Germany and shifts into discourses of meritocracy:

I’m fairly well off personally, my parents have pretty good jobs but my dad’s parents came from Germany, so they came from, not nothing but I mean they moved here and had nothing when they came, so I don’t have money from generations. And my mom’s family, I think my mom’s parents had her when they were 18 or something and she just moved around, and then got pretty good business jobs. I definitely know the value of hard work and stuff like that in terms of that. But I guess white privilege, especially here, the river basically separates oppression . . . you can’t help but see it. You know what I mean?

Silas shared the common narrative that white settlers “build a life from nothing,” constructing Canadian nationals as gaining social and political status through hard work (St. Denis & Schick, 2003). These narratives serve to erase how white settlers received access to land title rights, voting rights, mobility rights, public education, and other institutional and state resources which were not extended to Indigenous people and people of color (Schick, 2014; Thobani, 2007). Silas suggested that he “knows the value of hard work” from his immigrant parents, constituting himself through discursive practices of whiteness as “superior work ethics,” while non-whites and Indigenous people are co-constructed as lacking effort. These discourses serve to justify and normalize racial inequalities created through nation building practices.

In the last line of this excerpt, Silas mentioned white privilege and how “the river basically separates oppression,” touching on the ways in which urban spaces are racialized through practices of whiteness. Silas states that he is aware that white privilege and oppression exist “you can’t help but see it.” This excerpt positions Silas as both superior and innocent within a colonial context, so that by acknowledging that we “see” inequality, we are no longer complicit. Leonardo (2009) contends that white confessionals of privilege, while part of the process of learning antiracism, are not adequate for challenging systems of injustice; our work must also include challenging unequal practices.

In the following excerpt, Jade shares how poverty in Indigenous communities was normalized. Many anti-colonial scholars have conceptualized theories that help us understand how white subjectivity is co-constructed with Indigeneity (Fanon, 1967; Said, 2003; Thobani, 2007). In particular, students in the ACG30 had opportunities to investigate the ways in which class systems have been racialized and gendered through research that shows how racist policies are normalized and systems of dominance become naturalized through colonial discourses.

Jade: I guess I didn’t have a very thorough understanding of what caused the poverty. I mean I probably felt kinda the way that a lot of people do, like maybe it was sort of their fault.

Sheelah: Like weren’t working hard enough or didn’t finish school, those kinds, or was there something else?

Jade: I guess I never even really questioned it, was the weird thing, I never even really wondered why, that’s just the way it was.

Sheelah: That’s just the way it was?

Jade: Yeah, like the majority of First Nations lived in poverty and that's the way it was, like downtown [name of city], and I never really questioned why.

Sheelah: And so, did any of your schooling ever help you think about that?

Jade: No, I don't think so.

In this excerpt, Jade suggested that the systemic poverty experienced by Indigenous people had been normalized and that she was socialized “like a lot of people” to believe that “maybe it was sort of their fault.” I asked her to relay the dominant discourses that she had heard or used which might explain how it was “their fault”; common deficit narratives that suggest people are inferior such as “they don't value education” (Valencia, 2010). Deficit discourses such as these blame subjugated groups for lacking the skills or resources to succeed, obscuring the colonial violence used to maintain inequality.

Jade admitted that she never really questioned why there was inequality, believing that the inequality many Indigenous people experienced was natural, or “just the way it was.” Jade suggested that she never questioned it rather than name the racism implicit in her beliefs. Jade performed whiteness by constituting herself as innocent of racism, even as she described her beliefs that Indigenous people were naturally unequal. These narratives produce essentialist notions of indigeneity as inferior and mark whiteness as superior, masking the ways in which the wealth of the white settler state is built off of Indigenous bodies and lands. While Jade suggested that nothing from her experiences of schooling intervened in these discourses, she failed to acknowledge the race thinking that structured these discourses.

Our home on native land. There were several opportunities in the AGC30 course for students to question nationalist discourses which reproduce the myth that the Canadian state has

jurisdiction over Indigenous lands. This false legitimacy is reproduced through various tropes, rituals, and institutional systems that legitimize and justify occupation and land theft (Theilen-Wilson, 2012; Thobani, 2007). The marking of territory as belonging to white settlers is essential for the reproduction of the nation-state in the face of longstanding tensions over land title and jurisdiction between white settlers and Indigenous people (Arvin, Tuck, & Morrill, 2013).

One of the research assignments in the AGC30 course requires that students research a timeline of Indigenous land struggles, both past and contemporary, and present their findings to the class. As an introduction to the assignment, we watch the film by Alanis Obomsawin called, *Kanehsatà:ke: 270 Years of Resistance*. The purpose of the film is to provide some analysis that might challenge dominant discourses regarding Indigenous rights and land claims. As Thobani (2007) suggests, national narratives construct Indigenous people as “making impossible and unending demands for special treatment in their claims to land and state funds” (p. 4). In this excerpt, Noah talks about the students’ reactions to learning about the occupation of Kanehsatà:ke by the Canadian army:

‘Cause some people said you’re in our land, which I think is funny, Canadian land, you’re in our country or whatever, you follow our rules. And then other people say no it’s actually their country, they can follow their rules ‘cause it’s their damn country, but the opinions on that and the surprise too ‘cause you don’t learn about that, you learn about the Riel resistance I guess it’s been called now, it was called the rebellion when I learned about it, you learn about that every year in elementary school, but you don’t learn about the Oka crisis ‘cause it’s a lot less cut and dry and it’s more recent.

Noah suggested that during our study of the occupation of Kanehsatà:ke or what is known as the Oka Crisis, students had varying opinions regarding who had legitimate title to the land. Noah reacted to students who argued the land was “ours” or belonged to white settlers by stating “which is funny.” This language constituted Noah as superior to his colleagues and as someone who viewed their arguments as amusing or ironic. This performance of self-assurance or “knowing better” as well as distancing himself from other students reproduced Noah’s innocence. White subjects distance themselves from racism by “telling on” other racist whites (Kailin, 1999; McLean, 2007). This move to innocence reproduces and upholds the idea of individualism and the notion of Noah as a “good white.”

Noah stated that students in the course were “surprised” when they learned about the Oka crisis. The silencing in schools and other institutions regarding recent land struggles maintain white settler logics that situate colonialism as a historical event rather than an ongoing practice (Wolf, 2006). Noah talked about how the language and framing of the 1885 resistance had changed over time from rebellion to resistance. This shift in language is important as it signifies a challenge to the discourse that the federal government has authority over Indigenous land and people. As Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill (2013) suggest,

Conceptualizations of land and place that rely upon latent notions of property are tangled in the ideologies of settler colonialism, dependent on constructions of land as extractable capital, the denial of Indigenous sovereignty, the myth of discovery, and the inevitability of the nation-state. (p. 21)

Noah's memory of AGC30 students' reaction to learning about Oka; "you're in our country, you follow our rules," shows how white subjects embody and perform colonial state narratives that reproduce the myth of state jurisdiction of lands. As Thobani (2007) suggests;

The final goals that courts and governments have shared—the desired outcome of litigation, as well as land claims and treaty negotiations—is the extinguishment of Aboriginal title, absolutely and forever; and the confirmation of the singular sovereignty of crown title, absolutely and forever. The entire discourse of Aboriginal title presupposes a sovereign alien to Aboriginal peoples who nevertheless has the power and authority to determine the extent to this title. (p. 63)

In another interview regarding jurisdiction of land, Sam suggested that white settlers' lack of knowledge on our history of colonialism may be a barrier to the redistribution of land and resources back to Indigenous people. I asked her if it is possible that white settlers are aware of the injustices, but fear that they will have to give something up. This is an excerpt from her response:

I think that's what keeps everything in place too because really, in order to have Native rights to their land we would have to give up those resources that are on that land. We'd have to give up, in order to put change in place you obviously have to sacrifice something and I think people who are comfortable in their nice house with their nice car and a nice job, it's like if my family, I think a lot of the time it is about family in the end.

Sam suggested that white settler resistance to Indigenous self-determination in Canada was based on the protection of our access and control of Indigenous land and resources, passed down through family inheritance; "It is about family in the end." As Leonardo (2004) suggests;

“Although it is crucial that whites ‘buy into’ racial justice since they arguably possess the strongest form of investment in race, they also have the most to give up in terms of material resources” (p. 143). Sam rightfully stated that social justice required a redistribution of social and material wealth, and that racial dominance protected inequality. Sam stopped short when she stated “It’s like if my family,” and then shifted into talking about families in general. This shift suggests a discomfort with implicating herself or her family as protecting their social positions and maintaining inequality. This is common for students and teachers of antiracism who can abstractly and generally analyze about the violence of racial inequality, but find it much more difficult to implicate ourselves (Razack, 1998; Thompson, 2003).

It is important to note Sam’s positioning in the protection of “family” in this excerpt. As Nagel (2000) suggests, “Women occupy a distinct, symbolic role in nationalist culture, discourse and collective action, a role that reflects a masculinist definition of femininity and of women’s proper place in the nation” (p. 252). Sam is subjected into discourses of white femininity as a symbol of the national family. As a white woman, Sam’s role is to protect and maintain the family (McClintock, 1995).

Part II: Disrupting Nationalist Discourses: On Being Good, Feeling Good

In Chapter 5, students used language that had positive connotations to describe the pedagogy of the AGC30 course, particularly in relation to other educational experiences. This data was fairly specific to the atmosphere of the class and the ways that the course was structured. However, as students began to talk about the content of the course, the language shifted to descriptions of how difficult it was. —Words such as “hard,” “overwhelmed,” and “guilty” were often used to describe students’ experiences of learning the course content. As

Kumashiro (2000) suggests, “rational detachment is impossible: one’s identities, experiences, privileges, investments, and so forth always influences how one thinks and perceives, what one knows and wills not to know” (p. 39).

Boler (1999) suggests that theorists must engage in “rethinking emotions as collaboratively constructed and historically situated, rather than simply as individual phenomenon located in the interior self” (p. 6). Emotions are therefore “structures of feeling” that constitute “a medium, a space in which differences and ethics are communicated, negotiated and shaped” (Boler, 1999, p. 21).

In the following excerpts, students describe memories of the emotions they experienced in the AGC30 course. Foucault (1990) and Butler (1990, 1993) suggest that subjectivity is constituted through discourse, making it significant to explore how teaching alternative discourses to students may disturb their notions of themselves. There is a vast body of research which documents white settler feelings of guilt and shame when we are faced with our own culpability in ongoing systems of oppression (Bishop, 2002; Marx, 2004; Norquay, 1993; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012; St. Denis & Schick, 2003). Feminist, critical race, and queer theorists have interrogated the embodied nature of white identity construction along with the feelings of “grief and loss that accompany significant change in ways of being white” (Thompson, 2003, p. 21). The feelings of discomfort my students often experienced in the course are a common and important foundation for denaturalizing whiteness. In the following excerpt, Abby provides an example of embodied white nationalist discourse;

I'm really ashamed right now actually to be Canadian, especially currently with what we're doing with the tar sands and with the environment and even with our social programs, how they're just being shut down. I think it's shameful.

The words “ashamed” and “shameful” suggest that students come to identify with nationalist discourses as either something in which to be proud (read: good) or something for which we are ashamed (read: bad). These narratives of superiority and innocence constitute Canadian subjects such as Abby and produce various emotional effects when they are challenged. While it is a common part of the process of learning integrative antiracist education for dominant groups to feel guilt or shame, it is important for students and teachers to move past this process into thinking about how to position ourselves in solidarity work towards justice. As Boler (1999) states;

What is at stake is not only the ability to empathize with the very distant Other, but to recognize oneself as implicated in the social forces that create the climate of obstacles the other must confront. (p. 164)

Boler (1999) asks “what it might mean to take action in these circumstances?” (p. 164). For those of us positioned in dominant groups, taking action begins by challenging our own thoughts and actions, intervening in dominant discursive practices and positioning ourselves in solidarity with those most directly affected by colonial violence.

The following excerpt is an example of how integrative antiracist pedagogy can disrupt the invisibility of whiteness as the center or norm;

Abby: I think the idea of white supremacy was something that was really important to learn. And it was actually hard, I found it hard.

Sheelah: What was hard about it?

Abby: It was because you, I mean you don't think of yourself as different at all in some ways because you're a part of the majority. And then that's sort of singling us out as something other than what other people are . . . and I thought it was hard because I hadn't thought about it before.

The discourses of *difference* are popular in school contexts. When Abby said “you don't think of yourself as different at all” she was talking about being part of the dominant group or as she said “part of the majority.” As Mackey (2002) suggests; “The state of being unmarked (and therefore ‘normal’ or ‘ordinary’) is both constitutive of, and an effect of, structural advantage and power, and the cultural authority that that power brings” (p. 21). Dominant groups are constructed as both normal and superior and the gaze of the dominant group constitutes who and what can be *seen* or made intelligible (Dyer, 1997). This means that when teachers use pedagogy that turns the gaze, subjects from the dominant group are made visible, our violence is made intelligible, and we are discomforted and at times immobilized by it. Exposing whiteness is part of the work of integrative antiracist pedagogy.

Throughout the course, we use examples to illustrate how subjugated groups are constructed as “knowable,” subsequently erasing the practices of dominant groups (Kumashiro, 2000). Abby suggested that as part of the dominate group, it was difficult to be “singled out” because she had not “thought of it this way before.” Abby's white privilege meant that she never had to think about white supremacy. It is significant to note that nothing from Abby's education before Grade 12 invited her to question her position as part of the dominant group.

White subjects are accustomed to feeling good about who we are—so much so that when

systemic practices of oppression are exposed in classrooms through an analysis of power, it can be discomforting for both teachers and students because it challenges our innocence. In the following excerpts students share some of these feelings;

Roxy: I think 'cause it was my first time around lots of the antiracist stuff was hard. It's hard to wrap your brain around it 'cause it's so big and can be so, can bring you down so far and make you totally lose hope. And I remember walking out of some of those classes feeling I was just really overwhelmed. And just trying to keep your head above all of it and not get bogged down by guilt and by the vastness of the issues like racism. I remember that being really hard.

In this excerpt, Roxy suggested that learning integrative antiracism could “bring you down so far” and “make you totally lose hope.” As mentioned previously, these are common emotions dominant group members experience when learning about relations of power. It is important for teachers to continue to support students through this process without centering the alleviation of white guilt as the focus of the course. As Thompson (2003) suggests;

White guilt mourns genocide, slavery, land theft, lynchings, and broken promises as part of a past that can no longer be changed—and in so doing seeks to return to an imagined innocence. Since the past cannot be changed we insist on being allowed to feel good about ourselves. Yet this is a solution only if the problem is white helplessness rather than racism. (p. 24)

The students' feelings of discomfort and crisis are important positions of learning. In fact, many scholars contend that this process is essential to unlearning dominance (Kumashiro, 2004; Leonardo, 2009; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012; St. Denis & Schick, 2003). As Leonardo (2009)

suggests, white guilt can be a paralyzing emotion that blocks critical reflection. Discussions of white privilege and white guilt focus on individual blame and people become more concerned with whether they “appear racist” rather than understanding structural racism.

In the following excerpt, Kate talks about how she and another student would process the course materials outside of the classroom:

I would feel angry a lot. Like I remember Jess and I used to go, and we’d go for bike rides and just rant the entire time, we’d have angry rants about how screwed up just everything was. And then just, like a lot of that, but then there’d be little things of light shining through that’d be like OK, well it’s OK ’cause we can do this. And then 10 minutes later there’d be more information on the bad stuff so . . . But there would be the little lights where it’d be like, OK I feel better.

Over the years many students have talked to me about feeling angry during or after class. Kate suggested that learning “information on the bad stuff” made her feel angry, but that there would be “little lights” that made her feel better. I did not ask Kate what those little lights were but it is significant to analyze how dominant subjectivities become focused on *being good* and *feeling good* as this is a way to maintain innocence and superiority (Applebaum, 2004). The protection of whiteness is re-centered in this process, but in a way that makes students feel better about themselves rather than exposed or vulnerable. As will be explored in Chapter 8, those of us socialized into dominance will, at times, engage in solidarity work that positions us as “doing good” rather than work that creates substantial challenges to inequality (Dei et al., 2005).

While the majority of the white students described feeling guilty or overwhelmed, Erin talks about the impact integrative antiracism had on her learning as an Indigenous woman;

I remember definitely even getting angry like I said, just realizing that all of the hatred that I had towards myself from elementary school on was a lot to do with the fact that I thought I was somehow inferior and obviously I didn't think, "oh I'm inferior because I'm a First Nations person" but it was there, it was always there in my head. And then studying the literature on antiracism, on the history of racism, the construction of whiteness all of a sudden just put words to the things that I had always known existed and gave me a way to express what I was feeling and realize that I wasn't alone in it.

In this excerpt, Erin suggested that she was angry when she recognized how she had been subjected into discourses of white heteropatriarchy. Just as white subjects internalize their superiority, these violences lead many marginalized people such as Erin to internalize the dehumanizing discourses of inferiority. Erin stated that integrative antiracism gave her the language to name and analyze systems of power she had internalized growing up which helped her understand her experiences as effects of white settler colonialism. Integrative antiracism can be a significant intervention in understanding how nationalist discourses are embodied by subjugated subjects.

For dominant subjects, simply discussing these issues creates tensions and resistance, even though they have not been asked to give up any material wealth (Leonardo, 2009). This resistance, the protection of subjectivities that benefit from social power shows that students have some awareness that language provides meaning that is materialized. The students' management of discourses of whiteness are examples of how dominant subjectivities reify and protect the boundary making of nationalism.

Conclusion

The analysis from the participant interviews suggest that students employ various strategies that protect their positions of dominance. The maintenance of whiteness occurs in the everyday talk and actions of teachers and students in classrooms. The narratives of white national pride erases the historical and contemporary practices which have maintained violent and stark inequalities. Canadian-ness as a national identity in which only white settlers belong marks Canadian nationalism as a white space. This means that school sanctioned nationalism through curriculum, textbooks, and school rituals and events normalizes state systems that reproduce white heteropatriarchy in a colonial context. The constitution of national subjects in schools reifies white settler colonialism which must constantly be remade because it is invariably unstable.

In a colonial context such as Canada, whiteness is governed through discourses of nationalism, liberal multiculturalism, and meritocracy that justify settler jurisdiction over Indigenous lands and resources. The institutional and cultural celebration of individualism and tolerance inscribes the bodies of white settlers who come to represent the “good nation” as citizen subjects (Mackey, 2002; Schick & St. Denis, 2005; Thobani, 2007). White teachers and students are invested in these discourses precisely because we come to embody this innocence while pursuing social, economic, and political supremacy. Whiteness produces subjects who feel good (superior) and want to be good (innocent), even (and especially) when we are learning about social justice.

Chapter 7: Queering Subjects

In my first month of teaching in a new high school, three students came and asked if I would facilitate a Gay-Straight Alliance. It was right after I had taught a short story with a lesbian character, which opened a space for our class to talk about heteronormativity. The students told me that this would be the school's first GSA, as the previous principal was unsupportive. I agreed and co-facilitated with the Art teacher and the three students from my course took on leadership roles by coordinating all of the meetings, events, and media throughout the year. One of the student leaders who identified as Two-Spirit came to me at the end of the year and told me he wanted to wear the clothes he was comfortable in on the last day of class, which meant he would dress in drag. I let him know that we would all support him, but I felt a responsibility to tell him (as though he did not already know) that he would likely face violence from the students and community. Shawn responded, "I'm 6'4" in heels. No one will fuck with me." We both laughed, but deep down I worried that he would not leave the school grounds unscathed. Stories such as these are a vivid reminder of how I have participated in regulating gender and sexual norms as a straight cisgender teacher.

Drawing from Foucauldian theory of subjectivity, this chapter will examine excerpts of participant interviews from the data themed The Canadian Identity and coded for discussions on gender and sexuality. The analysis from this chapter will show how heteronormativity regulates the discursive practices of students as they discuss what they learned in the AGC30 course. In a colonial context, state formation depends and reinforces certain identities that are produced as normative. The students' self-constitution into particular societal norms shows how white heteropatriarchy is reproduced through the everyday practices of the students and teachers

(Warren, 2001b).

In his discussions of disciplinary power, Foucault (1990) contends that science played a central role in producing citizen-subjects as normative or deviant through discourses of sexuality. These classification systems created rules about sexual practices that constitutes a person's moral and social value (Weems, 2004). Foucault (1990) makes the connection between productive power and the body arguing that sexuality is a significant form of power because it is a "means of access both to the life of the body and the life of the species" (p. 149). Foucault contends that discourses on sexuality were the foundation for notions of deviancy later established by 19th century scientific studies which were legitimated as "truth." As Foucault (1990) states of medical science,

It claimed to ensure the physical vigor and the moral cleanliness of the social body; it promised to eliminate defective individuals, degenerate and bastardized populations. In the name of a biological and historical urgency, it justified the racisms of the state, which at the time were on the horizon. It grounded them in "truth." (p. 54)

These scientific discourses on sexuality and race gained legitimacy at the same time that colonial states were constructing modern notions of "the good society" and "good citizenship" (Weems, 2004).

The discourses within scientific disciplines justified state policies and social practices that regulated gender and sexual norms, women's bodies, and intimate relations between racialized groups (Dhamoon, 2009; McClintock, 1995; Ng, 1993; Stoler, 1995). As Stoler (1995) suggests, in both Europe and in the colonies, discourses on sexuality were produced relationally through a racial counterpoint so that notions of moral superiority, for example, were

reserved for white subjects and in particular white femininity. These discursive practices worked together to reproduce and normalize systems of whiteness and heteronormativity in colonial states.

Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill (2013), Driskill (2010), and Wilson's (2007) research focuses on the complex gender and sexual identities and expressions within Indigenous nations and the detrimental impact of colonial practices. As Driskill (2010) suggests, "While our traditional understandings of gender and sexuality are as diverse as our nations, Native Two-Spirit/LGBTQ people share experiences under heteropatriarchal, gender-polarized colonial regimes that attempt to control Native nations" (p. 69). Rankin (2000) contends that compulsory heterosexuality functioned as an integral element of nation building strategies. The resistance to white heteronormativity is rooted in the historical struggles of Indigenous peoples.

The purpose of the AGC30 course was to give students opportunities to investigate the ways that heteronormativity has been firmly rooted in all of our institutions, disciplining both Indigenous and non-Indigenous subjects into normative ways of thinking and performing. This chapter will be organized into two themes that were evident in the discourses used by students regarding gender and sexuality. *Part I: The White Heteropatriarchal Gaze* will examine nationalist constructions of the family and the gendered body and analyze how students are self-constituted as normative within these discourses. *Part II: Silence as a Discourse* will analyze the regulation of discourses on sexuality and race and how students are performatively constituted through heteronormativity. While the techniques of the gaze and silencing work simultaneously, it is helpful to understand how they work in particular instances of practice.

Part I: The White Heteropatriarchal Gaze

The white heteropatriarchal gaze acts as a panopticon that regulates bodies through surveillance and self-surveillance (Foucault, 1995). This surveillance takes place through various matrices such as mass media and popular culture which were the sites we focused on in the AGC30 course. Panopticism works through constellations of discourses that produce social norms and values regarding constructions of the body, conventional beauty, performances of masculinity and femininity, and significations of heterosexuality and queerness. These discourses work relationally to govern heteronormativity and are reproduced through self-surveillance. According to Butler (1990) heteronormativity refers to a matrix of discourses that produce binary and essentialist constitutions of sex, gender, and sexuality. Drawing from Foucault (1990), Butler argues that racialized and sexed bodies are socially produced through discourse rather than determined by an internal “essence.”

The students engaged in an analysis of identity construction through various films, articles, and discussions that provided both historical and contemporary examples of how bodies are racialized and gendered. The class also had opportunities to examine how citizenship was organized around constructions of the white heteropatriarchal family to prepare them for The Roots assignment (discussed in Chapter 6) by studying government laws and policies that limit immigration, voting rights, marriage laws, and other markers of status for women and queer people. As Rankin (2000) suggests, “The project of defining national identities in Canada has always involved significant attention to the regulation of sexual preferences and practices of Canadians” (p. 177). These discourses produce dominant notions of Canadian-ness as white and heteronormative, excluding the wide spectrum of gender and sexual expressions from

“citizenship.”

The Good Family

As signifiers of the heteronormative family and domestic space, the bodies of white women mark the internal boundaries of the nation-state (McClintock, 1995; Rankin, 2000). In the formation of the colonies, McClintock (1995) suggests that

Increasingly vigilant efforts to control women’s bodies, especially in the face of feminist resistance, were suffused with acute anxiety about the desecration of sexual boundaries and the consequences that racial contamination had for white male control of progeny, property and power. (p. 47)

In white settler societies, the “good” white woman is produced as middle-class, ideally a mother, and someone who embodies heterosexual norms (Dhamoon, 2009). White women’s sexuality was regulated through various discourses of sexual purity and innocence, while lesbianism was marked as a sign of social degeneracy (Rankin, 2000). These discourses work to fix women’s social role under the gaze of the colonial nation-state.

In the following excerpt, Viv remembers talking about her family in the AGC30 course. She became emotional when she shared this insight: “I was bullied all through school and to finally be able to talk openly with other people about it.” I paused the interview for a few minutes when Viv became upset and then she went on to discuss how difficult elementary school was for her because her Mothers are lesbians. Viv was bullied and ostracized throughout elementary school, noting that when she moved to the city and started high school she did not discuss her family with any of her peers or teachers until our AGC30 course:

Viv: I didn't have any problem telling anyone in that classroom about my family. And that's what it should be, I should be able to do that anywhere but unfortunately, I can't.

In this excerpt, Viv described performing self-surveillance as a survival mechanism because her family was marked as queer. Viv noted that she was regulated by the homophobia and violence that she has faced previously regarding her family. Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill (2013) explain that settler colonialism organizes citizens into male dominated heterosexual family units in order to normalize all heteropatriarchal structures within the nationstate. These discursive practices uphold white heteropatriarchy and any transgressions to this structure, such as Viv's queer family, threaten these relations of power. As Rankin argues, "Lesbians reproductive capacity and the so-called 'lesbian baby boom' of the past decade are of particular consequence, given that nationalisms characteristically are concerned with women's role in transmitting the cultural identities of their nations" (Rankin, 2000, p. 192).

Once socialized into systems of dominance, national subjects will perform various types of policing, including violence, in order to maintain them (Smith, 2010). These are the relations of power that continue to play out in stories shared by students like Viv who experience colonial violence. As Nagel (2000) states "As exalted 'mothers of the fatherland' their purity must be impeccable, and so nationalists often have a special interest in the sexuality and sexual behavior of women. Women embody family and national honor"(p. 254). To analyze Viv's experiences of homophobia as individual acts of bigotry erases the colonial context of white heteropatriarchy which structures and reproduces this violence.

Rankin (2000) suggests that in spite of many important changes towards equality, there is a refusal from the state to remove the heterosexual family from the central iconic and legal

orders of the Canadian nation-state. As Driskill (2010) contends, “Indeed, the urgent need to trouble and denaturalize the close relationship between nationalism and heterosexuality is precisely what makes the notion of a queer diaspora so compelling” (p. 76). These hierarchal systems of identity construction rely on and work to enable one another (Fellows & Razack, 1998).

Performing Gender

Butler (1993) theorizes gender as a “performance” of identity which is produced by discursive practices that regulate bodies. She also suggests that subjects can resist through discursive agency: “Contexts are never fully determined in advance . . . the possibility for a speech act to take on a non-ordinary meaning, to function in contexts where it has not belonged, is precisely the political promise of the performative” (Butler, 1997, p. 161). While the performative reinscription of a single subject does not shift normative meanings, Butler (1997) suggests that a wide community of people performing a recitation over time can shift discursive practices.

Butler contends that performatively constituted subjects are intelligible through the repetition of discursive practices that take the form of particular subjects. In the context of white settler colonialism, these discursive practices circulate through all of our social and political institutions. As Razack (2008) suggests,

What is immediately evident as one pursues how white supremacy is embodied and enacted in the everyday is that individuals come to know themselves within masculinity and femininity. Put another way, the sense of self that is simultaneously required and

produced by empire is a self that is experienced in relation to the subordinate other—a relationship that is deeply gendered and sexualized. (p. 63)

The discursive management of sexual practices in the colonies classified subjects into distinctive kinds and continues to be fundamental to the formation of the nation-state (Stoler, 1995).

Youdell (2005) contends that the constellations of sex-gender-sexuality are concerned with bodily pleasures and practices, but are also discursively inscribed onto the body.

Body rituals. One of the projects I assigned the AGC30 students was a class presentation called “Media Studies” that asked students to analyze a genre of media they use regularly and are most familiar with (magazines, music videos, movies, etc.). Groups were required to provide both an analysis of the representation of racialized and gendered bodies and include a visual summary to present their findings. This was the first of several research projects that provided students with an opportunity to research how particular identities and performances are normalized through dominant discourses in the mainstream media and popular culture. In the following excerpt, Kara shares her insights from the Media Studies research:

Like I never really bought into the whole have to be 6 feet tall and super thin ‘cause my bone structure just doesn’t fit that. Yeah I never really got into those ideals about gender, I did a little bit. . . .I mean obviously it’s going to influence us still as much as we try to fight it, we’re constantly seeing these things. But I guess knowing that like, yeah those aren’t really the truth and like the models you see are 12 years old, they’re underdeveloped, they’re super thin, you know? And they’re like plastered with makeup and then they’re picked apart with computers . . . it’s just I feel like I got more confidence

after this class, I was just like “well I don’t look like that.” I look around and none of my friends really look like that. I was like, ‘cause we’re human beings, we all have flaws.

The self-surveillance that women perform over the body is in obedience to the white heteropatriarchal gaze (Bartky, 1990). Kate reified gendered body norms by suggesting that she had never “bought into” conventional discourses of femininity and beauty because her body did not reflect these norms. Rather than explaining that these norms are problematic constructions, Kate suggested that her body was *flawed*. Kate admitted that while we are all affected by these discourses, the critical analysis in the course gave her “more confidence” because she realized “we are human beings, we have flaws.” The purpose of the media analysis was to both understand identity construction and to denaturalize dominant discourses that constitute bodies in particular ways. Rather than challenge the discursive frames that constitute female beauty and femininity through thinness and perfection, Kate suggested that women who deviate from this are “flawed” which maintains dominant cultural norms of beauty.

Bartky’s (1990) research analyzes the many ways women’s bodies are disciplined into the project of femininity;

In the regime of institutionalized heterosexuality, women must make herself “object and prey” for the man . . . In contemporary patriarchal culture, a panoptical male connoisseur resides within the consciousness of most women: They stand perpetually before his gaze and under his judgement. Woman lives her body as seen by another, by an anonymous patriarchal other. (p. 72)

Bartky’s (1990) list of the many “rituals of adornment” women are expected to perform daily suggests that it is through these regulating practices that the “ideal body of hetero-

femininity” is inscribed (p. 68). It is through these bodily rituals that individuals perform white femininity and societal standards of beauty. Bodies that deviate from this norm can only be marked as flawed if the norm remains intact.

Hypermasculinity. According to Nagel (2000) modern forms of western masculinity and nationalism link discourses of manliness with the project of empire. For example, acts of discovery can be described as “moments of pure (male) origin” that compensate for male anxiety regarding biological offspring (McClintock, 1995, p 30). These practices of claiming and settling Indigenous lands requires the rituals of flags and titles to provide symbolic proof of origin. Descriptions of imperial endeavors embody the virtues of normative masculinity such as honor, courage, discipline, competition, strength, and virility. “The culture and ideology of hegemonic masculinity go hand in hand with the culture and ideology of hegemonic nationalism” (Nagel, 2000, p. 249). Terms such as patriotism and bravery are both nationalist and masculinist terms.

While the value of these normative traits may vary from one time and place to another, these discourses have produced institutions such as government, industry, and the military which are organized into white male dominated hierarchies. Each time our class investigated the topic of gender norms, students from the AGC30 suggested that these discourses were still prevalent in their social life. For example, Noah shared his perception of the regulation of masculinity or what he terms “manly men”:

They don’t cry, they don’t share their feelings, it’s none of your damn business, that kinda thing. They try not to flinch when they get hurt, they have all these, you might almost call it conservative, it’s very old style values of what it is to be a man. You

smoke, you chew tobacco, you work with your hands, you know same deal. You don't talk about your feelings, you don't do any of that girly sissy stuff because that's for women, which is completely unfair but that's just the values, they've been brought into it is the thing.

Noah's list provides us with some examples of how masculinity is regulated by discursive practices of "manhood" and is constituted relationally through constructions of femininity. Noah positioned himself outside of these gendered performances by using the third person "they" to describe the citations from men he knew and had worked with. However, later in the interview, Noah talked about what he thought would be necessary for broader changes in the society;

So you kind of build up this activist army so to speak, maybe not the best word to choose but it's what came to my head, 'cause I'm a macho man.

Noah problematized his use of the word "army" by subjecting himself into a masculinist performance. It is possible that he was being facetious as he often was throughout the interview. The use of sarcasm and humor was used periodically by students to break the tensions or say things that would otherwise be unsayable in this context. Sarcasm also positions one as "knowing" or having the insider point of view. Rather than being disruptive, Noah's solution of an "activist army" reifies heteropatriarchy and the militarism required to maintain white settler colonialism.

In the following excerpt, Abby suggests that students in our class, in particular students who she identifies as male, began to perform differently inside of the classroom:

I also liked that we focused a little bit on gender construction for males. . . .I think it was important for a lot of boys in the class because I think they get ignored a lot of the time in

like Sex Ed and stuff . . . I think we all became comfortable being outside of that in this classroom as well, and like you would still see some of the boys here in the hallways acting completely differently than they did in here, with this group of peers who were learning the same things.

While Abby did not provide specific examples, it is not difficult to infer the prevailing discourses of hetero-masculinity that might have been performed “by the boys” in the hallways. Abby suggested that sex education “ignores” boys, however it is this “invisibility” that produces dominant identities as natural and normative and marks gender and sexual issues as “women’s issues.”

During the interview, Abby suggested that the students became comfortable performing “outside” of dominant gender and sexual norms. Abby was not the first student to share an insight with me regarding how the course shifted particular performances of their classmates. This suggests that performativity is produced within spatial and temporal contexts where transgressions are possible, particularly in spaces where students have access to alternative discourses regarding gendered and sexual identities.

Queer theories and movements for gender and sexual equality differ in their analysis and struggles because there are tensions to gaining full citizenship rights under state laws. While this may give queer identified people some gains (i.e., the right to marry) it also upholds and legitimates the nation state’s heteropatriarchal structures and laws. As Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill (2013) contend; “Indigenous communities’ concerns are often not about achieving formal equality or civil rights within a nation state, but instead achieving substantial independence from a Western nation state – independence decided on their own terms” (p. 10). This means that

queering pedagogies also require a questioning and disruption of nationalist discourse and practices (Hunt & Holmes, 2015).

Part II: Discourse of Silence

One of the many disciplinary techniques used to govern subjects in schools and other institutions is the regulation of what can and what cannot be said, who can speak, and what constitutes knowledge. As Foucault (1990) states;

There is no binary division to be made between what one says and what one does not say; we must try to determine the different ways of not saying such things, how those who can and those who cannot speak of them are distributed, which type of discourse is authorized, or which form of discretion is required in either case. There is not one but many silences, and they are an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourse. (p. 27)

The discourse of silence is pervasive in school practices and regulates the multiple and dynamic gender and sexual identities and expressions that exist. Ironically, schools construct “professionalism” in a way which desexualizes the experience of students and teachers while simultaneously reproducing heteronormativity and punishing those who deviate from it (Meyer, 2007; Youdell, 2006b).

One of the examples of the ways in which gender and sex roles are constituted in schools is through what is not sayable. In the following excerpt, Erin describes this silencing and what she remembers learning about feminist and queer theories:

One thing that I guess I hadn’t dealt with before we went into that class is the ideas of sexuality and gender. Being a generally straight cisgendered woman I never really dealt

with issues surrounding that and then being in a space where kids were comfortable to talk about their sexuality or their gender identity, I found it awkward at first, which I was really surprised by just because it's something you just, you don't talk about. So that was probably one of my, my first introduction to feminism and queer theory and all of those issues too which have influenced me in my social justice work and in dealings with my friends.

In this excerpt, Erin suggested that discussions regarding sexual identity and gender norms did not take place in her other courses. Positioning herself as a cis-heterosexual, Erin stated that she had never dealt with these issues before the AGC30 course. Butler (1997) suggests that these performatives do not have to be spoken; they can be textual, representational, or constituted through a silence or erasure as they are cited through a range of practices. Students who identify as straight can perform their gender and sexual identity without much thought.

Erin said that because of this silencing she, “found it awkward at first,” which suggests schools are marked as sex-neutral spaces. As Youdell (2005) contends “schooling and sexuality sit in an uncomfortable relationship. It has been argued that schools and sexuality are constructed as fundamentally discrete and that the people who populate schools—students and teachers—are constructed as intrinsically non-sexual” (p. 251). These discourses of “sex neutrality” reproduce the pervasive context of heteronormativity. At the end of the conversation, Erin suggested that feminist and queer theories have had a significant impact on her activism and interpersonal relations.

Only one of the students said he did not recall learning much about sexuality in AGC30 when I asked what he remembered learning. This was his response:

Sheelah: Do you remember talking about sexuality in the class?

Silas: Maybe a bit. Not really though because it's very, I don't know. I don't think anyone in that class really had a problem with people who, different sexual orientations or whatever. I know there was people who were fairly Christian but even at that still very liberal. There was no one who was "I wanna change who you are." Everyone was "if you wanna do that then whatever" right.

Analyzing the dominant discourses regarding sexuality layered in Silas' response is significant for understanding why it is important to teach about heteronormativity. Silas suggested that teaching about sexuality and gender was unnecessary as no one in the class was homophobic. Silas positioned himself as both heterosexual and progressive when he stated, "you wanna do that then whatever," marking queerness as particular sex acts, as well as positioning heterosexuals as the authority required to sanction/approve of queerness (Meyer, 2007). Silas said teaching about homophobia "brings in very personal things," individualizing sexuality rather than seeing heteronormativity as a colonial structure that had social and political consequences (Wilson, 2013). Silas managed language in ways that both protected his privilege as a white cis male and marked him as "progressive" towards queer issues.

Given the context of white heteropatriarchy in Canada, it is not surprising that Theo, who identified as queer, shared his own analysis of heteronormativity in public schools:

I remember high school wasn't exactly the most queer-positive environment at the time, so it was very frustrating that way. It felt a lot like - what am I gonna do? Where am I gonna meet people? What kind of community is out there for me to socialize? . . . it was very heteronormative and that's something that I kinda jumped on, or a concept that I

jumped on and realized a lot of this society is, is just the impression that you're straight, you're wanting a relationship, you're wanting monogamy, and this is kind of the binary that we live in.

Theo suggested that schooling was not a "queer-positive environment" which left him questioning how he might build a life once he graduated from high school. The regulation of heteronormativity is so pervasive in schools that students and teachers who do not identify as queer, but whose gestures, clothing, or mannerisms appear to deviate from the norm, will face similar homophobic violence as those who identify as queer (Cosier, 2009). For youth like Theo, the heteronormative school environment appears to reflect the world outside of these spaces which silences and erases the many queer communities that do exist.

During our interview Theo mentioned that he was involved in community activism regarding queer issues. I asked Theo if there are Indigenous youth involved in the queer community and this was his response:

I find a lot more of the white queer community or whatnot, they get a little more involved 'cause usually the Aboriginal community's a lot more involved in the Aboriginal aspect, but that's changing as well, that's something that some of the pride centers initiatives are going forward with and it's bringing that connection back.

Theo suggests that the "white queer community" is more visible and active in the city while Indigenous people that identify as queer get involved in the "Aboriginal aspect." Theo may have been referring to the Two-Spirit community. This segregation comes from a long history of colonial practices of regulation and exclusion in Canada. Wilson's (1996, 2007, 2013) research suggests that Two-Spirit identities were severed from their communities through colonial

policies and practices, indicating that race, gender, and sexuality cannot be understood in isolation, but rather should be taught and analyzed as settler colonial formations. According to Smith (2010) queer culture has been dominated by white middle-class men who have the greatest social mobility, which means that many LGBTQ2 spaces are reproduced as white spaces. Morgensen (2010) describes the continued erasure of Two-Spirit people from queer communities as a form of nationalism he refers to as homonationalism;

Over time non-Natives were able to form shared identities and movements to claim modern sexual citizenship in the settler state. Under such conditions, queer movements can naturalize settlement and assume a homonormative and national form that may be read specifically as homonationalism. (p. 106)

Integrative antiracist pedagogy requires that we recognize how nationalism is implicated in ongoing white heteropatriarchy as colonial state violence.

The effects of colonial violence continue today in various ways towards queer and Two-Spirit youth (Smith, 2010). Students who identify as LGBTQ2 are one of the most vulnerable populations within our public school systems. In fact, research studies suggest that high numbers of LGBTQ2 students will attempt suicide or engage in suicidal ideation (Cosier, 2009; McNinch, Totten, & Thomas, 2005; Wilson, 2013). Classrooms and curricula represent a major socializing force, yet the culture of public schools continue to enforce heteronormativity.

The daily practices described in this chapter can be understood as technologies of control that reproduce colonial relations of power. Students and teachers are subjectivated into these discourses and internalize them as “natural.” In the excerpt above, Theo stated that the queer organizations he collaborated with were working on coalition building between the Two-Spirit

community and the non-Indigenous queer community, yet this is clearly an ongoing issue.

Conclusion

The examples of students surveillance and self-surveillance described in this chapter can be understood as disciplinary techniques that reproduce white heteronormativity. State formation requires subjectivities that signify and perform white heteropatriarchy. The discursive practices that uphold the Canadian state and its citizens are reconstituted through the students' embodiment of nationalist narratives. Youdell (2005) contends that "school is a key site for the proliferation, modification, and incessant inscription of these discourses and, therefore, the production and reproduction of 'compulsory heterosexuality'" (p. 253). The 2003 and 2005 GLSEN [Gay Lesbian & Straight Education Network] studies of school climate found that "actual or perceived sexual orientation is one of the most common reasons that students are harassed by their peers, second only to physical appearance" (Cosier, 2009, p. 289). This is particularly true for gender variant and transgender youth who have the painful task of trying to pass as cisgender until they have completed school or are pushed out of school when they are nonconforming (Cosier, 2009; Meyer, 2007).

Scholars such as Kumashiro (2009) are calling for teachers to teach queerly or in a way that denaturalizes hierarchies of power and to interrogate how schools continue to reproduce inequalities in multiple and complex ways. What might it mean to queer our pedagogy? As Hunt and Holmes (2015) suggest,

As a verb, queer is a deconstructive practice focused on challenging normative knowledges, identities, behaviours and spaces thereby unsettling power relations and

taken for granted assumptions. Queerness is then less about a way of being and more about doing that offers the potential for radical social critique. (p. 156)

This call must be taken up with a renewed commitment to disrupting white settler colonialism in public schools.

Chapter 8: Practices of Empire

The first rally our AGC30 participated in was a march in support of a local community center that would give people access to numerous health facilities where few services existed. The new provincial government cut the funding set aside for the development, and local organizers called for public pressure to ensure the building would get support. The second rally our class attended involved protesting the appearance of former president George Bush who was in our city on a speaking tour. Our class helped organize the rally and several students spoke at it carrying (the best) signs that read “More Trees, Less Bush.” These actions can be read as pedagogies that politicize the community, or as momentary disruptions in Canadian civility. Ultimately they served to position us as insiders/outsideers in state practices of domination.

This chapter will examine the data coded Activism and Social Justice where students discussed the community projects they were engaged in during and after the AGC30 course. Drawing from Foucault’s theory of subjectivity, I will analyze how students performed discourses of liberal individualism, white civility, and saviorism both during and after the course. The nationalist discourses of Canadian benevolence explored in this study govern practices of social justice by marking particular kinds of performances as acceptable forms of “good citizenship” while other constitutions are regulated as non-normative and marked as “bad activism” (Kennelly, 2009). I will also suggest that the state sanctioned forms of social justice through citizenship education produce white cis subjectivities that perform innocence and superiority by doing “the right kind of work” (Thompson, 2003).

This chapter is organized into two sections: *Part I) Good citizenship* will examine how

state discourses of individualism and benevolence are reproduced through student performances of social justice. The good citizen is deemed to have characteristics and qualities that are desirable for the nation-state, constraining performances of activism. These practices naturalize inequality and maintain relations of power between “the server” and the “served.” *Part II)* *Global citizenship* will analyze the discourses of white femininity as innocence by students who describe their continued engagement in social justice through transnational voluntourism. The constitution of “citizenship” through discourses of white heteronormativity constrain who can be a “good citizen” or a “global citizen.”

This chapter will show how students s drew from dominant narratives that produced them as “caring helpers” and “white saviors,” maintaining subject positions that were both superior and innocent as they engaged in justice projects. As Heron (2007) states;

Both as individuals and as national subjects, white middle class Canadians and other Northerners continue to construct through the prism of a planetary consciousness a sense of self in moral terms that expressed the entitlement and obligation bourgeois subjects feel to “help” Others. (p. 34)

The white savior complex is seductive for dominant groups engaged in social justice because they can “*do good*” while maintaining social and material domination. As Straubhaar (2014) suggests, “both the oppressor and oppressed receive myriad messages justifying their unequal placement within social hierarchies, messages that can make our social positionalities seem natural, or even deserved” (p. 383). Heron (2007) and Schick (2000b) contend that white women in particular are called to these subject positions as stakeholders in the reproduction of white femininity as innocence.

Part I: Good citizenship. The section in the AGC30 curriculum that detailed the “application” of social justice discussed opportunities for students to do service-learning. Service-learning has become an integral part of many high school and post-secondary educational programs and generally entails student community service work in organizations such as food banks. As Bickford and Reynolds (2002) point out, these programs have been critiqued for their emphasis on charity rather than on structural inequality. It induces people to ask “how can we help these people” instead of the harder question, “why are conditions this way?” (p. 213). The majority of the schools who engage in these educational programs are white and middle class (Kennelly, 2009). When students from dominant groups are involved, service-learning can devolve into tours of “Otherness,” reifying power differentials. Designing education that might intervene in these dynamics would be extremely difficult and requires long-term commitments between communities. Volunteerism such as service-learning has likely been more prevalent because it is easiest for instructors to organize and implement in one semester (Bickford & Reynolds, 2002).

I chose instead to facilitate students in class projects that focused on youth led conferences, awareness campaigns, and non-violent direct actions such as protests. I also provided students with opportunities to research social change movements and meet with local grassroots activists. The goal of the projects was to combine critical analysis with action and reflection. As Bickford and Reynolds (2002) suggest, “ A historical and geographic approach to activist learning projects will give learners a broader understanding of dissent and encourage them to envision themselves as actors and agents in political issues” (p. 230). Some of the issues that we focused on such as homophobia, racism, poverty and violence against women were not usual matters for public school events, however our projects were, for the most part, in keeping

with normative models of public awareness campaigns.

Citizenship education can be understood as an example of discursive practices that produces particular kinds of state subjectivities (Kennelly, 2009). Institutions such as schools focus on individualized charitable models of social justice such as service-learning, fundraising, or volunteering and “good citizens” called to these models are produced as white, cis, and straight (Heron, 2007; Kennelly, 2009). As Kennelly (2009) suggests, the good citizen is someone “who engages in worthwhile community projects that can resemble activism,” (p. 132) whereas the bad activist “steps beyond the bounds of good citizenship to challenge state claims to legitimacy” (p. 132). In these tropes good citizens do not dissent government practices or colonial state institutions, particularly in a public forum. State discourses limit what social justice activism can mean in the Canadian context and these discourses create geographies of exclusion where the bodies of activist subjects are marked as “outsiders” to the Canadian state (Kennelly, 2009; Walia, 2013).

State subjects and active citizenship. Kennelly (2009) suggests that Foucault’s concept of governmentality is useful in understanding the role the Canadian state plays in reproducing particular models of social justice. Drawing from Rose’s (1993) analysis of Foucault, Kennelly describes how the modern liberal state regulates the choices of citizens by celebrating particular kinds of activist subjects while criminalizing others. The discourses of individualism produce self-governing citizens who rely less on collective rights and more on “self-improvement” practices. This kind of activism “makes people feel good” as they subscribe to various types of consumerism such as attending speaking engagements or purchasing books and t-shirts (Kennelly, 2009).

This type of social justice model is popular in Canadian public schools because it is in line with curriculum which markets character education, community engagement, and service-learning models of social justice. As Kennelly's (2009) suggests,

The form of subjectivity implied by the civics curricula is the model of the desirable citizen within the context of neoliberal states, whose qualities include endless self-scrutiny, an individualized focus on one's personal development over and above the well-being of the collective, and the capacity to continually renegotiate one's skills and identity in light of the demands of global capitalism. (p. 133)

The initial guide for AGC30 proposes to foster responsible and well informed "active citizens" (AGC30 Curriculum Guide, 2007, p. 6). These models of social justice emphasize liberal reforms through state institutions such as charities and voting, that limit how students think about and perform social change. In an example of this from student interviews, Sage discusses their group's presentation to City Council regarding the adoption of a campaign called Earth Hour:

It was really empowering to go to city council. I mean it's not like a really controversial thing to ask city council to back Earth Hour, so they jumped on the idea and it was relatively easy for us because of the global scope of the campaign . . . but it was also, it was really intimidating, you're still a youth and you're talking to these people in positions of power and it's a really good experience in terms of public speaking.

Earth Hour is a global sustainability campaign that invites cities to shut down all the lights for 1 hour in the evening once a year. The event was created to raise awareness of climate change and the ongoing depletion of non-renewable energy sources. Sage stated that presenting this campaign to City Council was "empowering," constituting her agency as a "good citizen"

through performances of white saviorism (Srivastava, 2005). Sage admitted that this campaign was acceptable because it was an awareness campaign that was not “controversial.” Such “controversial” actions might include organizing non-violent direct actions that may pressure City Council to implement sustainable policies, intervening in their ongoing support for extractive industries. While awareness campaigns can be significant for shifting public discourse, it is a slow process of cultural change that often does little initially to disrupt relations of power.

Many environmental campaigns such as Earth Hour are framed in a post-racial context of “climate change” that is palatable to the white settler public it is created for (McLean, 2013). These discourses erase the Indigenous communities that are directly affected by resource extraction, who continue to put their bodies on the line to stop further destruction (Walia, 2013). Without an analysis of the unequal consequences of environmental destruction on all racialized communities, environmental education can become a place where “good” white people maintain superiority by saving both the environment and people of color, which includes Indigenous communities devastated by environmental destruction (McLean, 2013).

Sage ended the discussion by talking about how she had personally benefitted from the campaign by “practicing her public speaking,” emphasizing the continued self-mastery and self-improvement that are prevalent in liberal models of social justice. These discourses maintain a type of self-surveillance that produces the good citizen-subject and obscures the significance of grassroots organizing towards change.

Charity versus justice. Initially, in the first year of the AGC30 program students were expected to form small groups and create a local education or action project. In subsequent years

we moved towards larger class projects. Students had opportunities to deliberate and choose (through consensus building) what each project might entail. While each class had opportunities to learn about the tensions between charity work and the need for necessary structural changes, there were times students chose to incorporate fundraising into their projects.

One example of this was an event students called the ‘Concert for Change’, which brought together local bands and local community-based organizations under a catch phrase that read: ‘*Keep your coins, we want change*’. This event was highly effective in bringing out a large crowd and connecting youth peers to local community groups that focused on social and ecological justice. Erin and her colleagues organized the concert to raise awareness regarding violence against women and the money collected from ticket sales was given to a local women’s shelter. In the following excerpt, Erin talks about organizing this event:

Erin: The best part about Global Citizenship was the combination of the theory and then the practice because even if it felt like it wasn’t connected, all of a sudden when you started doing this project, you would realize how much the theory came into it. Like the Concert for Change that me and my friend Morgan helped organize. It gave us a lot of practical experience dealing with all of the complexities of setting up a concert while at the same time remembering why we were doing the concert.

Erin suggested that their project gave the students practical experience in organizing a large event, performing liberal discourses of self-mastery. The discourses of individual self-improvement are prevalent in the participant interviews, while descriptions of how their project furthered social justice in the community were less common. Erin noted at the end of the discussion that there were some tensions during the concert as well;

Morgan and I had prepared some statements to read in between the bands playing which didn't turn out the way we wanted it to because it was so loud and just realizing that maybe a rock concert was not the best venue for giving lengthy speeches on activism. As part of the class strategy towards organizing, students would meet after events to debrief and discuss what they had learned. While the students hoped to provide some information regarding violence against women, this goal was complicated by the venue. In the end, this project was a charity event that provided a few students with an opportunity to organize a large scale gathering.

The idea that social justice can be pleasurable came up several times in the interviews. As Roxy stated, "You can spread social justice and have a lot of fun too." The discursive frame of pleasure eases the guilt and discomfort of complicity and maintains power relations between the "server" and the "served." The violent inequality subjugated groups experience daily becomes a backdrop of entertainment for those of us born into privilege. Engaging in these types of events reiterates our goodness, while doing little to enact structural changes. The arts have been a significant space for resistance to injustice, however rather than disrupt power relations, charity venues can normalize hierarchal relations of power.

While some forms of charity provide a necessary redistribution of resources, it should be understood as temporary relief from a system that requires significant changes. Charitable models are problematic because they perpetuate the notion of white cultural superiority, particularly if students do not receive a critical education regarding how colonialism reproduces the social and political supremacy of white heteropatriarchy (Cammarota, 2011). The charitable model positions predominantly white middle class group members as "saving or helping"

inferior groups rather than being implicated in ongoing colonial practices. Jade touches on this in the following excerpt:

Jade: I liked the way that we always looked at the root cause of the issue and we talked about how that's the thing that has to change. We had a class where we talked about charities and how charities actually aren't very helpful because they keep this cycle going more than anything, they just encourage the idea that we have power, and we can be the hero and save people.

Sheelah: We meaning who?

Jade: The white majority, like middle class or higher, I guess. And we always looked at the root causes of the issues and how racism causes that, and our economic system causes that, and stuff like that.

In the excerpt above Jade remembered learning about the white savior complex in our course and that we worked to challenge this by investigating root causes of inequality. Jade suggested that this type of organizing “keeps this cycle going more than anything.” In fact, the white savior complex is so prevalent that there are entire industries built around it, Non-Governmental Organizations being just one example. Even though we investigated these power relations in each class and students could relay them in the interviews, students continued to be drawn to normative social justice actions such as charity work and voluntourism. As Sensoy and DiAngelo (2012) contend, “there are social, psychological, and material rewards for conformity such as social acceptance, being treated as “normal” and career progression” (p. 18). This is an example of how dominant subjects can learn to use the language of integrative antiracism without changing their practices.

White settler subjectivities are constituted through discourses of individualism and white heroism (McLean, 2013). These subject formations regulate the ways in which students performed social justice activism. Challenging the root causes of inequality requires the difficult work of interrogating our own complicity in colonial mechanisms of white heteropatriarchy such as capitalism (Razack, 1998). Change requires long-term grassroots coalition building where dominant subjects follow the lead of those who are directly affected by colonial violence. As feminist activist bell hooks (2000) reminds us, “Support can be occasional. It can be given and just as easily withdrawn. Solidarity requires sustained, ongoing commitments” (p. 67). These challenges require continued pressure on systems that we as dominant groups benefit from, which includes speaking out and organizing publicly against them.

Bad activists. The term “active citizens” can be found in some civics school curriculums to signify social justice models such as service-learning and fundraising, however the term “activism” is rarely used in school settings (Kennelly, 2009). This is because activist subjects work against the state institutions and policies that maintain inequality. The point of activism is to organize actions that put pressure on state systems of power. These challenges to the legitimacy of the state often provoke surveillance from police and other authorities which marks these acts of resistance as “bad” and positions activists as “outsiders.” These discourses will also shift, depending on the social positioning of the subject, so that resistance by queer and Indigenous people, as well as and activists of color face vastly different responses from the state and the public than white normative activists. In the following excerpt, Gabi shares her preconceived notions of activism:

Sheelah: How did the class or course materials or even the experiences shift or alter your perception of social justice?

Gabi: I guess I was kind of talking about that before and just that social justice doesn't necessarily need to fit into any one mold. And we kind of talked about ways you can just live your own life in a socially responsible way and we talked about bigger ways that you can do it. And I think just that you kind of have an image of activism as people yelling with signs and that doesn't necessarily have to be the way that it is.

Gabi described a spectrum of activism we discussed on the course, from the individualism of becoming "socially responsible," to the "bigger ways" such as organizing. As Bickford and Reynolds (2002) note, "[Students] need a broader understanding of activism to see both that they are often activists already, albeit unwittingly, and that they can decide to be activists—that activism consists of acts of dissent in which they can and sometimes do engage" (p. 240). Many of the students suggested that their previous perception of activism shifted through the course. The metaphor "people yelling with signs" came up as a reference to activism more than once in the interviews. Students who made this reference could not see themselves protesting and described it with negative connotations. This type of non-violent direct action disrupts state disciplining, marking it as undesirable to students who are socialized into state narratives of good citizenship.

Gabi: We also talked about activism a lot in terms of it not being such an intimidating thing and smaller ways that you could do it, and that you don't necessarily have to be like you know Martin Luther King to be involved in activism.

Many students also suggested in the interviews that they believed previous to the course

that they had to be someone famous to engage in social justice activism, often citing names such as Martin Luther King Jr. A similar finding was published by Bickford and Reynolds (2002) who studied college students engaged in service-learning;

Many of our students appear to recognize activism only as participation in huge events planned by global or national organizations: marches, rallies, and the like. They imagine activists as heroes, courageous and dedicated in ways that seem impossible to emulate. They do not recognize grassroots efforts as activism, and they do not see themselves as potential actors in either local or larger arenas. (p. 240)

Throughout the course our class connected with grassroots individuals and groups that were working towards social and environmental justice in various ways. Some of the speakers were Indigenous land defenders, spoken word poets, environmental scientists, film makers, and youth activists representing larger networks. We also studied historical and contemporary social movements that were led by grassroots people. As Picower (2012) states, “In addition to teaching the root causes of inequality and how they affect students’ material conditions, SJE [social justice education] emphasizes teaching about movements and the processes by which liberating change has happened” (p. 7). Sam discusses the significance of this kind of education further in the following excerpt:

Well, I felt like social justice was something that certain radical people or governments could do if they wanted to, like things that were higher up than me and more powerful than me. And I feel now that social justice is something that the masses have to participate in in order for it to be effective, especially with our revolution unit that we did and looking at all the riots that were happening and stuff like that . . .

Sam's use of the word "radical" to describe her initial perception of social justice is another iteration of the "bad activist" and "people yelling with signs." Given that the Canadian-state is produced through discourses of benevolence, actions that question this seem illogical and are marked as "radical" acts. As Sensoy and DiAngelo (2012) suggest; "When we object that this perspective is radical, we are also saying the mainstream or dominant perspectives are not radical; in other words they are perceived to be neutral and objective" (p. 132). The narratives that mark activism as radical work to justify the surveillance and criminalization of legitimate protest and mark activists as "outsiders" in the Canadian imaginary. Discursive frames that signify justice work as "radical," erase the extreme practices of state violence and exploitation that create and maintain white heteropatriarchy.

Part II: Global Citizens

The most common model for social justice in schools and other institutions across the Canadian-state is global service-learning and voluntourism (Balzer, 2011; Kennelly, 2009). Several students talked about engaging in international charity or development work both before and after our course was completed. In fact, this kind of charitable model was often the only social justice model that students were aware of before our course. The narrative that social justice is served by white outsiders who "lift the poor and oppressed in developing countries" is universal in the western world (Straubhaar, 2014, p. 384). The reproduction of white savior narratives are pervasive in literature, film, and the "helper" professions such as social work and teacher education programs, positioning white subjects, and in particular white women, as superior and innocent in the face of stark inequalities (Thobani. 2007).

The term "global citizen" signifies a white subject that can transcend borders. This idea

of transcendence depends on the erasure of the colonial violence which has marked bodies in differential ways. Social justice advocates in education and other fields use the term global citizenship to signify the humanitarian goals of “doing good,” but it is essential to think about what it means to “do good” in this context and how particular subjectivities are positioned to “do good” (Razack, Smith, & Thobani, 2007).

Straubhaar (2014) and Cammarota (2011) contend that the white savior complex is a powerful discourse which reifies the binary of superiority/inferiority that is integral to colonial relations of power. White subjects are believed to be uniquely positioned to empower racialized Others, erasing the agency of people from countries marked as “third world,” and obscuring white complicity to ongoing inequality. Many of the students talked about their previous experiences working with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) such as Oxfam. Heron (2007) explains that these organizations thrive on reproducing the North, and especially Canada, as “orderly, clean and well managed in comparison.” They are led by white national subjects who have “knowledge, values and ways of doing things are preferable and right” (p. 3).

Although some NGOs do supply much needed goods and services to communities where resources are scarce, it is essential to analyze how a charitable model of work may further reproduce colonial practices rather than challenge them (Kahne & Westheimer, 1996; Plewes & Stuart, 2007). These are the organizations that schools and other institutions align themselves with as they are predominantly run by white settler Canadians and work from a charitable model (Straubhaar, 2014). In the following excerpt, I asked Nova if she was involved in social justice before AGC30:

Nova: Not a lot but before the class we had opportunities with (organization), they did projects where they were collecting school supplies and household items and stuff like that and sending them to nations in Africa, like Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, places where certain items were needed and my friends and I were involved in a couple of those projects through the school. With Kenya we did a pencil drive because for school in Kenya the one thing you need is a pencil and then basically school was free as long as you had a pencil you can take your notes with . . . Other than that nothing really.

This account by Nova showed how white students were constituted through transnational discourses of social and economic power through “charity work.” This perplexing example of students organizing donations such as pencils for other countries is common in school systems across Canada (Kennelly, 2009). Students are invited to send money and materials to other countries, often without an understanding of colonialism, exploitation, and the displacement of Indigenous peoples. As Teju Cole (2012) suggests; “One song we hear too often is the one in which Africa serves as a backdrop for white fantasies of conquest and heroism . . . Africa has provided a space onto which white egos can conveniently be projected” (p. 2). School projects of charity enact these fantasies of saviorism through hundreds of school children who are subjected into whiteness.

White savior tropes play out in multiple and problematic ways and are so seductive because they position individuals as generous and good while masking relations of power. As Cammarota (2011) explains, “The incorrect assumption that poor people lack resourcefulness exonerates social or economic structures from any culpability in reproducing poverty and oppression generation after generation” (p. 253). It is also a way to obscure the violence of

global imperialism as well as the colonial practices that continue in Canada today.

White saviors. In Heron's (2007) research on development work, she contends that white female subjects desire development for purposes more complex than a desire to "help." According to Heron (2007), the desire for development is about the making of self through reproductions of the helpless Other. These discourses are significant because they position dominant groups as innocent (doing good) while doing little to address root issues that require the redistribution of social and economic power.

In the following excerpt, Sam talks about her volunteer trip to Kenya previous to the AGC30 course and how the youth group she went with discussed doing a similar project focused on Indigenous rights in Canada:

It's funny because that's something that I would definitely be interested in now but I haven't really heard anything about it but they mentioned it when we were there in Kenya and I was kinda like; "well I'm not really interested in that. I'm like whatever, I don't really care that much." And then after taking this class I'm like, seriously why didn't I? And it's because I think I hadn't realized the racism that's present in myself and in Canada in general. It's funny because we're like people can help themselves when they're in our own country, we're like OK, it's your fault that you're in this situation you're in. But then we're like save everybody else, like it's our responsibility to save all the children in Africa.

Although Sam questioned the notion she had about inequality in Canada, in this excerpt she maintained language that positioned her as "helping" First Nations people while problematizing "saving all the children in Africa." Drawing from the "White Man's Burden,"

these discourses constituted her as a white savior to “unfortunate” Others both in Canada and abroad. Razack (2008) states, “the Western subject becomes a subject through signifying the Other as different” (p. 109). Engaging in development abroad produces white female subjects that perform socially mandated “goodness,” while at the same time offering them positions of superiority unavailable in the white patriarchal systems of the Canadian state (Heron, 2007; Srivastava, 2005). As symbols of the nation state, white women can transcend these borders through the discourses of white saviorism and care.

While Sam confessed that racism kept her from “caring” about Indigenous issues until she was introduced to integrative antiracism, far from challenging white supremacy, the discourses Sam drew from positioned her within pastoral power. Many students were still drawing from these discourses in their interviews which suggests that these performances are integral to our sense of “self” as white citizen-subjects (Warren, 2001a).

During each interview I asked students if they continued to be engaged in social and ecological justice after they graduated from our course. Several students talked about traveling to other countries and Gabi describes this in the following excerpt:

Gabi: last winter I did about a month of volunteering in Peru at an orphanage, so that was kind of [pause]

Sheelah: What did you do there and why did you, how did you pick Peru?

Gabi: Well I knew that I wanted, I was travelling all over South America and I don’t exactly remember, I think I just kind of stumbled upon it. And the program that I found seemed good, it was a Spanish school and so you did a few hours of Spanish in the

morning and then your volunteer work in the afternoon, and that I was really into. In the end I don't think that it was necessarily achieving what I was hoping it would.

Sheelah: Why?

Gabi: The program seemed like it was geared towards North Americans that want to go to Peru and feel good about themselves, if that makes sense . . . to like you know play with cute little orphans and feel good about themselves for helping out . . . even though we weren't actually, I didn't feel like we were doing very much.

Gabi provided some analysis by suggesting that volunteers were there to "feel good about themselves" but never turned that analysis on herself as a young white woman. This allowed Gabi to position herself as superior to other whites that were there for individual pleasures.

Gabi's description of the volunteering shows how the white savior industrial complex reinscribes an atmosphere of carnival for white consumption (Heron, 2007). In the end Gabi said she was hoping to "do more," but she did not describe what she hoped she might be doing. These acts she performed at the orphanage were not enough to make Gabi *feel* like she was helping or making a difference, which is clearly why she chose to go.

It is important to note that all of the students who discussed their experiences with voluntourism offered some critique of the experience, however this did not dissuade them from continuing to desire it. As Kate states in the following excerpt:

Kate: I'd like to continue volunteering and travelling, 'cause I love travelling and I think volunteering is a great way to be able to do that because you see a totally different side of the country that you're in. I know one of the girls that I work with right now she went to

Cambodia before I did and she went on a tour which is more alcohol than helping, and she rode elephants and got drunk and went shopping.

Like many of the students, Kate continued to use the discourse of “helping,” and performed her femininity as innocence through the story of a young woman who engaged in charity work “for the wrong reasons.” This story positions Kate’s desires as altruistic, yet as Cammarota (2011) contends, “the theme of the individual savior whose actions of saving others from themselves as opposed to addressing oppressive structures elide the possibility of recognizing social injustices and the need for collective action to secure rights and opportunities” (p. 246). Kate’s desire to “see a different side” of the country reifies a white gaze that seeks out difference for self-constitution. The white savior dynamic is exploitive, and must be consistently problematized as we reposition the work we do within an antiracist praxis.

Conclusion

The excerpts from this chapter show how students are inscribed through state narratives of white civility and saviorism and practices that are constructed as “good citizenship.” These discursive frames construct and therefore limit how students think about and perform activism, producing subject positions that maintain colonial relations of power. In particular, the desire for voluntourism draws from discourses that justified colonial violence in the creation of empire.

Most of the projects we engaged in as a public school program focused on education and awareness raising in the school and community which is important, but has its limitations. In Chapter 6, I discussed how dominant groups are socialized to be good and feel good in regards to their identity, and this constitution is a dominant theme in the interviews. This move to innocence is a way to maintain superiority and to avoid the discomfoting truths regarding our

complicity in white heteropatriarchy. Integrative antiracist education must be framed in terms of structural restitution and justice rather than charity.

Chapter 9: Conclusion

During the last AGC30 I taught before going on educational leave our class attended an Idle No More rally. It was the middle of winter, in the middle of the day, and my students and I walked down the center of one of the busiest streets in the city in support of Indigenous rights and land protections.

The memory I have shared above occurred during the last AGC30 program I taught in 2013. This excerpt is significant for me because the Idle No More movement encapsulates what I hope to manifest in my pedagogy: It centers on the protection of Indigenous sovereignty and lands; it is a public refusal of white settler colonialism and nation building practices; it rages against ecological destruction; it summons acts of solidarity and calls for accomplices; and it embodies the power of non-violent direct actions. At the center of a pedagogy of justice is solidarity work that focuses on the redistribution of lands and resources back to Indigenous nations and an end to state practices that violate the self-determination of subjugated groups. This research has invited me to think through the pedagogical conditions required for making new subjects.

Drawing from Michel Foucault's theory of subjectivation, this self-study research invited students to share their learning in relation to the AGC30 course. Using discourse analysis of student interviews, my research questions asked: How do students describe their experiences of learning in a course where spaces are created for a critical reading of the world? What subject positions are made available to them through their words? This research examines how students that occupy positions of dominance were instantiated and perform themselves as (even better) Canadian subjects through their management of discourse.

This research contends that discourses of nationalism, liberalism, and state benevolence regulate the way students and I thought about and acted on social justice. The ways in which we negotiated discourses of the “good teacher,” the “good student,” and the “good citizen” are produced through discursive frames of whiteness and heteronormativity. This research contends that the nation-state is produced through practices of white heteropatriarchy, and these practices are required to maintain colonial relations of power. The nation-state is reproduced through the self-surveillance of subjects who perform state discourses of Canadian-ness as goodness and innocence. Reframing Foucault’s disciplinary techniques in the context of colonialism allows us to understand how discourses of race and sexuality produced hierarchies that define the nation (Stoler, 1995).

In a colonial context such as Canada, white heteronormativity is governed through constellations of discourses that rationalize settler jurisdiction over Indigenous lands and resources. The institutional and cultural celebration of nationalism inscribe the bodies of white settlers who come to represent the “good nation” as citizen subjects (Mackey, 2002; Schick & St. Denis, 2005; Thobani, 2007). The Foucauldian theories from which this study is drawn allow us to analyze the everyday practices of subject formation and think about the power relations that are at play in a public school setting (Youdell, 2006a).

Teaching as a Practice of Self-Exaltation

I began this research study with the assumption that teaching integrative antiracist education has been (primarily) an intervention into whiteness and heteronormativity. The purpose of my study and teaching in integrative antiracist education has been to intervene in these practices of domination. While I understand on some level that whiteness is never the

same thing twice, but rather multiple and shifting in its meaning (Ellsworth, 1997), I have been challenged by the implications of the findings in this study. Kumashiro (2000) suggests that what we do not know and do not desire to know constrains our teaching. In order to disrupt this we have to investigate what is not sayable or not known.

This self-study research has provided me with further insights regarding my own self-surveillance and management of language. For example, given my own struggle with complicity, the problematic ways in which students thought about and positioned themselves in this study may have been modeled by me in the classroom. This research has shown how individuals socialized into positions of dominance can provide some critical analysis in the same moment that we deny our complicity. Teachers' and students' desire for self-affirmation and repetition means that dominance may reinvent itself in new ways, even in courses focused on integrative antiracism and social justice

One of the goals of integrative antiracism is for students to understand inequitable power relations and challenge essentialist explanations for inequality. I sometimes refer to this as a power analysis, which allows us to understand the social production of difference and the processes that create inequality. In my first few readings of the data I was interested in what my students had learned and how they showed evidence of learning through their language and analysis. Having used various assessments over the years, I was especially interested in finding out how the teaching of integrative antiracism may have provided students with an analysis that might challenge some of the dominant discourses which are pervasive national narratives. However, as Kumashiro (2000) suggests,

The recognition that [teachers] can neither know what students learn nor control how students act based on what they learn, leads many teachers to feel paralyzed. After all, educators are trained to delineate what they want students to understand, plan a lesson to get them there, and then assess whether they indeed came to this understanding. (p. 39)

Reflecting on my responses to the student interviews, I realized that I was anxious to see if I was a “good teacher,” wanting to gather evidence that would represent assumptions about my pedagogy.

For example, as I was interviewing students, I felt a sense of validation when students said something I deemed critical and felt equally disappointed when they said something I viewed as problematic, as I saw both as a reflection of my own teaching identity. This is when I realized that teacher/student subjectivity is co-produced through pedagogy. In other words, the significations of “good teacher” and “good student” are co-constructed on the premise that the students and I would represent a particular kind of progressive white classroom. This insight helped me to reposition my analysis away from focusing on what students learned and towards the discursive practices that were evident in the data.

During the interview process I was often tempted (and sometimes did) intervene if the student shared something that I considered problematic. While these interventions did not change students’ initial responses, it may have influenced their responses later on in the interview. While qualitative interviews can be dialogic, it also may set up a dynamic where participants work to answer the questions with the “correct response” as guided by the researcher, particularly within teacher/student binaries and power relations. As well, sometimes in my attempt to maintain a neutral position during the interview, I missed opportunities to pose

further questions or dialogue that may have provided more detail. These tensions were part of the learning process for me as a researcher.

The first rough copy of this manuscript lacked analysis and self-positioning. This was a reflection of several difficulties I was having which were interrelated, however I will focus on two main problems: The first problem was my inability to move away from structuralist accounts of power. My conceptualization of state power left me and the students with little agency. While Prado (2000) suggests that it is common to misinterpret Foucault's theory of power as deterministic, this problem was closely related to the second difficulty, which was my discomfort in analyzing how the students and I were complicit in the ongoing reproduction of white settler colonialism. I believed that the AGC30 program disrupted whiteness and heteronormativity, and proceeded to tell a story that positioned me and the students as good whites. It was through further analysis of our subjection that I was able to understand Foucault's theory of disciplinary power and discursive agency in a new way.

Foucault's conception of disciplinary power shifts our analysis of power from the macro realm of structures and ideologies to the micro level of bodies (Gore, 1995). Foucault argues that a normalizing society is produced through particular discourses that circulate as social values and scientific classification systems. Foucault's notion of panopticism is a technology that exercises power as individuals internalize these norms through self-surveillance and self-regulation. Disciplinary techniques are not deterministic as power circulates through discursive practices in complex and sometimes contradictory ways. Foucault's theory of subjectivation can further our analysis of schools as technologies of control where knowledge production shapes the kinds of student subjects that are made in schools.

Agency and Resistance

This research study suggests that the production of individuals takes shape within historically situated spatial and temporal contexts, which means that agency is simultaneously made possible and limited by prevailing discourses and meaning. As Butler (1997) suggests; “Because the agency of the subject is not a property of the subject, an inherent will or freedom, but an effect of power, it is constrained but not determined in advance” (p. 139). This means that subjects are in process and, as Thobani (2007) states, “are only partially conscious of their motives and actions and inhabiting multiple positions with various intersecting identities and interests” (p. 8). As this study has shown, our subjectivities are often contradictory, fragmented, and unstable.

The data analysis from this research study shows how students would make statements that were sometimes contradictory. These tensions are common as students are provided with alternative discourses to think and talk about themselves in a colonial context. As Wetherell and Potter (1992) note,

We do not expect individuals to be consistent in their discourse—indeed, it would be very surprising if they were. Instead, we expect their talk and writing to vary as they draw on different repertoires to do explanation and justification in different contexts and to make their claims accountable. (p. 102)

Butler (1997) insists that when prevailing discourses are unsettled and reinscribed, subjects may themselves perform differently. However this shift does not necessarily mean that dominance has been disrupted—dominance can be reinscribed in varying ways. Youdell (2006a) argues that while schools are sites for tensions between dominant discourses as well as discourses which

have been denied, “particular discourses do seem to endure within the school context and traverse its locations, settings and moments” (p. 176). The repetition of particular discourses is one of the ways that dominant groups protect their privilege.

While schools may socialize students to naturalize their positions of dominance, students also become willing participants in these discourses because it maintains their humanity (Leonardo, 2009). As Leonardo (2009) suggests,

So it is not only the case that whites are taught to normalize their dominant position in society; they are susceptible to these forms of teachings because they benefit from them. It is not a process that is somehow done to them, as if they were duped, are victims of manipulation, or lacked certain learning opportunities. (p. 83)

The findings from this research shows some of the ways that white heteropatriarchy is reinscribed through common discourses found in social justice curriculums and classrooms. State discourses of nationalism, individualism, and good citizenship constrain integrative antiracist pedagogies. The students’ antiracist language became entangled with performances of dominance. This is because dominant subjects have access to a set of discursive resources for legitimating and protecting our social positions. As Wetherell and Potter (1992) suggest,

From our perspective then, an important part of antiracist practice is identifying the forms legitimization takes, and charting also the fragmented and dilemmatic nature of everyday discourse, because it is at those points of fracture and contradiction that there is scope for change and the redirection of argument. (p. 219)

Identifying and interpreting the patterns of discourse that legitimate inequality can help teachers and researchers to create pedagogies that challenge them. As Butler (1993) suggests, theorizing performativity offers significant promise for an analysis of change.

The question of agency within a constituted subjectivity remains a contested area of scholarship. Butler (1990, 1993, 1997) has also sought to theorize the production of subjectivity and the workings of agency in more detail. Butler (1993) argues that agency exists when social conventions are rejected, contending that the resulting discursive slippage is a means of resistance. In this way, there is opportunity for agency within discourses as one discourse enables critiques of others. Using this theory, agency can be understood as working within a constitution, while using alternative discourses to “resist, subvert, and change the discourses themselves” (Davies, 1999, p. 67).

Disturbing Praxis

Part of the work of integrative antiracist pedagogies is to intervene in the performance of dominance. My hope is that this investigation can further educational research on the connection between colonial discourses, student/teacher subjectivity, and classroom pedagogy. This research is written with an acknowledgement that there is much more to be learned from the collection of this data. A key contribution of this work is to show how the reproduction of racism and heteronormativity are “routine institutionalized processes and individual everyday practices” (Youdell, 2006b, p. 19).

The research on antiracist education suggests that there are many tensions that arise, particularly when teaching students that occupy positions of dominance (Carr & Klassen, 1997; Castagno, 2008; Haviland, 2008; Marx, 2004; Schick & St. Denis, 2005; Sensoy & DiAngelo,

2012). This self-study provides further discussion and analysis in a high school setting. While public school classrooms generally silence many of the topics we covered such as race and racialization, sometimes when we focus on a particular topic it reinforces “Othering”. As Kumashiro (2000) suggests regarding integrative antiracist pedagogies, “we are not trying to move to a better place, but rather work against the repetition of sameness, the harmful histories that have been cited” (p. 42).

As a form of social justice education, integrative antiracist pedagogy has historical roots which are informed by critical race theory and poststructural theories of power, with particular emphasis on interrogating how identity production is implicated in dominance and oppression (Kumashiro, 2004; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Integrative antiracist education seeks to counter various forms of oppression which are often conceptualized as “isms”: racism, sexism, heterosexism, ableism, classism, ageism, and others. Critical race, queer, and feminist theories examine the production of subjectivities as well as the roots of unequal practices in order to uncover the ways they have become historically embedded in our institutions (Kumashiro, 2000; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995).

This study investigates some of the ways that disciplinary techniques produce docile bodies submissive to teacher authority and national narratives. This is done through particular kinds of pedagogies, classroom geographies, knowledge production, and various forms of regulation. The examples of this are multi-layered and can be viewed as technologies of control that normalize white heteropatriarchy. As Berry (2007) states;

The “grand narratives” of Western Enlightenment: namely, European imperialism and history; Christian spirituality, morals, and ethics; immigration; capitalism; individualism;

the globalizing (Americanizing) of the world through modern technologies and media; and the compatible wars of positioning, discourse, and agency constitute a few of the organizing devices of modern education. (p. 21)

Each of the 16 students talked about racialization in our colonial context. As part of the effort to teach about white supremacy, the course explored the impact of white settler invasion on Indigenous peoples and territories in Canada and other colonial countries, as well as analyzing the various practices that exploit, regulate, and marginalize people of color. This is a significant aspect of understanding subject formation in a colonial context. As Leonardo (2004) contends;

A discourse on supremacy offers whites and minority students a progressive starting point because it does not cater to white racial thinking. Racial minorities comprise its projected audience, whether or not this is literally the case. As a result, it recognizes the existence of minority subjects and affirms their history. It begins from their starting point, one which needs little convincing about the reality of white domination.

Discourses of supremacy acknowledge white privileges, but only as a function of whites' actions toward minority subjects and not as mysterious accumulations of unearned advantages. (p. 149)

While our class investigated the ongoing practices of nation building that have exploited and violated people of color, the student interviews focused primarily on the impact of white settler colonialism on Indigenous people. This is likely due to the fact that white subjectivities rely on Indigeneity for their constitution in a colonial space, and teaching about this may have had the greatest impact on their memories of learning. While a few students discussed racism towards

people of color and immigration as a nation building practice, the absence of discussion on this in the interviews invites me to reflect on how I structure the course material and how I will address this in my teaching.

Queering Pedagogy

It is clear from some of the student interviews that rather than understanding heteronormativity as a system of power, some students continued to individualize queerness and construct it as sex acts. Also, while most students had memories of learning about gender, few explicitly talked about sexuality. This finding may reflect the fact that one program is not enough to disrupt heteronormativity, which is constituted through the erasure and silencing of queerness in public schools. However, because I taught about queer issues through research, film, literature, and guest speakers, this finding is disconcerting to me. The silencing of queer issues in the student interviews has invited me to question how I teach about queer theory and queer issues as a straight cisgender woman. As Kumashiro (2004) suggests;

Perhaps one reason that addressing queer issues is a difficult process is because we often search for comfortable ways to do this work. This leads me to wonder, what would happen if we explored approaches to social justice that were premised on being uncomfortable? ...I am interested in seeing what we can learn when we examine some of the ways that queer activism conceptualizes oppression and social justice. (p. 44)

In part, these tensions reflect the way in which most of the studentss talked about race, gender and sexuality as separate categories in the interviews. As Butler (1993) suggests;

The reproduction of heterosexuality will take different forms depending on how race and the reproduction of race are understood. And though there are clearly good historical

reasons for keeping “race” and “sexuality” and “sexual difference” as separate analytical spheres, there are also quite pressing and significant historical reasons for asking how and where we might read not only their convergence, but the site at which one cannot be constituted save for the other” (p. 123).

This is also indicate of how I struggled to teach about the interconnections of identity construction to high school students. As I deepen my understanding of integrative antiracism, I will continue to develop pedagogy that provides students with examples of the matrices of power which constitute white heteropatriarchy through queer theories and queer activism.

Youdell’s (2005, 2006a, 2006b) research studies of public high schools in the UK shows how sex-gender-sexuality have come to constitute each other in dominant narratives, and concludes from her research that schooling reinforces gender and sex roles which are more ridged than the broader society. This was also the finding in two research studies done on the Canadian prairies: First, a study on sexual difference for The Saskatchewan Teachers Federation found public schools to be one of the most homophobic and heterosexist institutions (STF, 2003), and in a similar study 2 years later, teacher-researchers concluded that, “The need to interrogate the curriculum and disrupt heterosexism through openly queer curriculum remains paramount” (McNinch, Totten, & Thomson, 2005, p. 2). These studies indicate the pervasive context of heteronormativity in public schools, and provide the impetus to further analyze the significance of integrating queer pedagogies in antiracist education.

Social Justice Activism in Schools

In the Canadian context, social and environmental justice activism is regulated by the white savior industrial complex, where white subjectivities are made through the construction of

the helpless Other. Nationalist narratives produce Canadian subjects that desire to be good and feel good, reproducing discursive practices of both innocence and superiority. This research study examined how teachers and students from dominant groups are socialized to be good, and feel good in regards to their identity, as this constitution is a prevalent theme in the interviews. This move to innocence is a way to maintain superiority, and to avoid the discomfiting truths regarding our complicity in white heteropatriarchy. Integrative antiracist education requires that we think about and act on projects that involve structural restitution and justice, rather than charity.

Most of the projects we engaged in as a public school program focused on education and awareness raising in the school and community which is important, but has its limitations. The student centered organization of the course meant that students were often drawn to state sanctioned practices such as charity work, while learning about the problems and critiques of it as a model for justice. In reflecting on this dilemma, it is possible that a more structured classroom would be helpful in easing these tensions. For example, group and classroom projects could be chosen from pre-planned projects and events with clear guidelines. While social justice pedagogies have been practiced in the K-12 system as well as in some teacher in-services, integrative antiracist education is most frequently used in higher education and community or adult settings, particularly those directed to social group identity-based oppressions such as gender, race, and sexuality (Adams, 2010; North, 2008). Adams (2010) argues that while the goals of social justice education vary from building awareness, to personal action, to institutional and systemic change, most social justice education practices at the school level focus on building individual awareness and knowledge in a formal school setting.

Some scholars, such as Banks (2005), argue that teaching about historically unjust political and economic systems, can provide students with a new understanding of personal, social and political issues, allowing them to take action to resolve them. Scholars such as Anyon (2009), however, acknowledge that critical consciousness provides a significant basis for understanding, but insists that raising awareness through readings and discussion does not induce people to participate in transgressive politics.

Educational scholars such as Tan (2009) and Anyon (2009) contend that in order to activate students to create and join social justice movements, it is important to get them involved in community organizing, resistance and protest activities.

Chapman and Hobbel (2010) agree with Anyon (2009) that no matter how controversial the material may be that we introduce in the classroom, and regardless of the range of authors our students encounter, these are not in and of themselves a guarantee of social justice activism. While it is essential to engage in queer, critical race, feminist, and anti-colonial theories, this research does not automatically elicit transformative learning. Privilege cannot be undone through confession alone, but rather through the creation of collective organizing that will dismantle the systems that enable these privileges (Leonardo, 2009). One of the goals of the AGC30 program was to move from critical analysis and reflection, into engaging in community organizing and activism. Education for social change is not simply about critical thought, it is about disrupting the ways of which subjectivities are produced. As Ng (2003) suggests,

Teaching and learning against the grain is not easy, comfortable, or safe. It is protracted, difficult, uncomfortable, painful, and risky. It involves struggles with our colleagues, our

students, as well as struggles within ourselves against our internalized beliefs and normalized behaviors. In other words, it is a lifelong challenge. (p. 217)

Opening spaces in research for issues, identities and narratives that have been previously absent or unrecognized in schooling has the potential to position the researcher and researched in new ways (Youdell, 2006b).

Self-Study Research in Social Justice Education

Many self-study scholars maintain that self-study scholarship is centered on liberatory education (Brown, 2004; Loughran, 2004; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2004), in that it focuses on educators taking responsibility for transforming their own practice. An integrative antiracist approach to education with an equity agenda has been identified by many as having a social justice orientation (Brown, 2004; Kumashiro, 2004; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2004). There is also a clear acknowledgment that we have not yet achieved these goals in our communities, or our educational institutions, which means that education must be centered on change rather than the preservation of the status quo. It also implies that we cannot rely upon what we already know and practice; we must work against harmful repetitions (Kumashiro, 2004). Kumashiro (2000) suggests that change requires becoming involved in altering citational practices,

What changes citations is a particular kind of labor. When activist labor to supplement harmful associations they are participating in altering them. (are constituting a reworked history, are performatively reworking history) when enough members of a community participate in this kind of labor citational practices change. (p. 42)

This involves risk-taking, attention to marginalized voices, and because social justice is an ongoing struggle, constant perseverance.

Loughran (2004), LaBoskey (2004), and Milner (2007) call for self-study research that serves to further investigate social justice in education, as there are critical areas of methodology and self-study that remain to be explored. These areas include the need to expand the repertoire for addressing class, race and culture, to the possibilities for sex and the body to become more central to self-study; and finally to the ways in which the study of selves/self can become more central (and documented within) institutional change and transformation. Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) also appeal for self-study which focuses on social justice as they assert that, “improvement of practice includes a commitment to an elimination of domination, exploitation, and discrimination of any one over another and a sensitivity to the many facets of diversity” (Preface).

There are common misconceptions that issues of equity, power and privilege only have relevance in certain classrooms. Both Brown (2004) and LaBoskey’s (2004) self-studies focused on race, gender and culture, which resulted in a greater understanding of the relationship between student’s experience and their position in the social order. As Brown (2004) and Milner (2007) contend, the notions of race, class, and gender inequities are just as important in *all* racialized classrooms; whether they are represented by the dominant society, a mixed classroom, or are predominantly students from marginalized groups. When educated on these issues, students within these classrooms can play an important role in contesting inequitable societal relations of power and privilege within their communities. This underscores the importance of placing these issues at the center of research on education.

Call to Action in Education

In reviewing the Canadian public school systems, The Canadian Teachers Federation

handbook on Education for Social Justice (O’Haire, 2008) cites that several teacher organizations throughout Canada explicitly view themselves as social justice unions. For example, the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation (STF) highlights social justice in the Federation’s Statement of Philosophy, with social and political advocacy as a key function of the STF Strategic Plan and Policy Handbook². As well, The Elementary Teachers’ Federation of Ontario (ETFO) and the British Columbia Teachers’ Federation (BCTF), have social justice as part of their mandate, clarifying a definition for school systems and practitioners.

Even teachers’ unions who do not explicitly identify themselves as social justice unions, have policies which include concepts such as equity, discrimination, anti-homophobia, poverty, Indigenous education, as well as other examples (O’Haire, 2008). This suggests that Canadian teachers’ organizations are aware of the need for social justice education given our current colonial context. This means that conceptualizing what social justice education should include, has great significance.

As social, political and economic inequalities continue to grow, there is an urgency in calls to promote social and environmental justice in public schools. It is my hope, that this research encourages teachers/activist to explore integrative antiracist pedagogies. As has been detailed in this study, the discomfort that students/teachers positioned in dominant groups might feel when we are implicated in systems of dominance, is necessary in shifting the ways in which violence towards marginalized groups are normalized in our classroom and communities every day.

² <https://www.stf.sk.ca/portal.jsp?Sy3uQUnbK9L2RmSZs02CjV/LfyjbyjsxsrvAsIqKA7Kc=F>

References

- Adams, M. (2010). Roots of social justice pedagogies in social movements. In T. K. Chapman & N. Hobbel (Eds.), *Social justice pedagogy across the curriculum: The practice of freedom* (pp. 59–86). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Adelman, L. (Director). (2003). *Race: The power of an illusion*. [Documentary] USA: California Newsreel.
- Alexis, S. (2007). *The absolutely true diary of a part-time Indian*. New York, NY: Little Brown and Company.
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (Notes towards an investigation). (B. Brewster, Trans., pp. 127-186), *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anyon, J. (2009). Critical pedagogy is not enough: Social justice education, political participation, and the politicization of students. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 389–395). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M., Au, W., & Gandin, L. A. (2009). Mapping critical education. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 3–20). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Applebaum, B. (2004). Social justice education, moral agency, and the subject of resistance. *Educational Theory*, 54(1), 59–71.

- Arvin, M., Tuck, E., & Morrill, A. (2013). Decolonizing feminism: Challenging the connection between settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations*, 25(1), 8–14.
- Austin, T., & Senese, J. C. (2004). Self-study in school teaching: Teachers' perspectives. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell, (Eds.) *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 1231–1258). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bacchus, M. K. (2006). The impact of globalization on curriculum development in postcolonial societies. In Y. Kanu (Ed.), *Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imaginations* (pp. 260–282). Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Baker, B., & Heyning, K. E. (Eds.). (2004). *Dangerous coagulations? The uses of Foucault in the study of education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Balzer, G. (2011). Why go to Guatemala? International service learning and Canadian high school students. In D. Stanley and K. Young (Eds.), *Contemporary studies in Canadian curriculum: Principles, portraits, & practices* (pp. 125–152). Calgary, AB, Canada: Detselig.
- Banks, J. (2005). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Bannerji, H. (1997). Geography lessons: On being an insider/outsider to the Canadian nation. In L. G. Roman & L. Eyre (Eds.), *Dangerous territories: Struggles for difference and equality in education* (pp. 23–43). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bartky, S. L. (1990). *Femininity & domination: Shades in the phenomenology of oppression*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Bell, L. A. (1997). Theoretical foundations and frameworks. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 3–16). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Berry, K. S. (2007). Exploring the authority of whiteness in education: An auto-ethnographic journey. In P. R. Carr & D. E. Lund (Eds.), *The great white north? Exploring whiteness, privilege & identity in education* (pp. 19–32). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1990). *The nation and narration*. London: Routledge.
- Bickford, D. M., & Reynolds, N. (2002). Activism and service-learning: Reframing volunteerism as acts of dissent. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, 2(2), 229–251.
- Bishop, A. (2002). *Becoming an ally: Breaking the cycle of oppression in people*. Halifax, NS, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.
- Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling power. Emotions and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Britzman, D. P. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Brown, E. (2004). The significance of race and social class for self-study and the professional knowledge base of teacher education. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 517–574). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Brown, L., & Strega, S. (2005). Transgressive possibilities. In L. Brown, & S. Strega (Eds.), *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous & anti-oppressive approaches* (pp. 1–8). Toronto, ON, Canada: Canadian Scholars' Press.

- Bullock, S. (2010). Learning to think like a teacher educator: Making the substantive and syntactic structures of teaching explicit through self-study. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 15(2), 291–304.
- Bullough, R. V., & Pinnegar, S. E. (2004). Thinking about the thinking about self-study: An analysis of eight chapters. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 313–342). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of 'sex'*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. London: Routledge.
- Cammarota, J. (2011). Blinded by the Avatar: White saviors and allies out of Hollywood in education. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 33(3) 242–259.
London: Routledge.
- Cappello, M. (2012). *Producing (white) teachers: A genealogy of secondary teacher education in Regina*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Regina, Regina, SK.
- Carr, P. R., & Klassen, T. R. (1997). Different perceptions of race in education: Racial minority and white teachers. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 22(1), 67–81.
- Castagno, A. (2008). “I don’t want to hear that!” Legitimizing whiteness through silence in schools. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 39(3), 314–333.

- Chapman, T., & Hobbel, N. (2010). Introduction: Conversations, problems, action. In T. Chapman & N. Russell (Eds.), *Social justice pedagogy across the curriculum: The practice of freedom* (pp. 2–12). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Clarke, A., & Erickson, G. (2004). The nature of teaching and learning in self-study. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.) *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 41–69). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Cole, T. (March 2012). The white-savior industrial complex. *The Atlantic Monthly Online*, (21), 1–2.
- Coleman, D. (2006). *White civility: The literary project of white Canada*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Cosier, K. (2009). Creating safe schools for queer youth. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 285–303). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cuenca, A. (2010). Self-study research: Surfacing the art of pedagogy in teacher education. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 39(2), 15–29.
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M. P., & Torres, R. D. (2009). Critical pedagogy: An introduction. In A. Darder, M. P. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 1–21). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Davies, B. (1999). *A body of writing: 1990–1999*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Dei, G. (1995). Integrative antiracism: Intersections of race, class and gender. *Race, gender & class: Perspective on Canadian Antiracism*, 2(3), 11–30.

- Dei, G. (1996). Critical perspectives in antiracism: An introduction. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 33(3), 247– 256.
- Dei, G., Karumanchery, L., & Karumanchery, N. (2005). *Playing the race card: Exposing white power and privilege*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Dhamoon, R. (2009). *Identity/difference politics: How difference is produced, and why it matters*. Vancouver, BC, Canada: UBC Press.
- Diamond, N., Bainbridge, C., & Hayes, J. (Directors). (2010). *Reel Injun: On the train of the Hollywood Indian*. [Documentary]. Canada: Independent.
- Dreyfus, R., & Rabinow, P. (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Driskill, Q. (2010). Doubleweaving two-spirit critiques: Building alliances between Native and queer studies. *GLQ*, 16(1–2), 70–92. DOI: 1215/10642684-2009-013.
- Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Earp, J., & Jhally, S. (Directors). (2006). *Reel bad Arabs: How Hollywood vilifies a people* [Video]. USA: The Media Education Foundation.
- Ellsworth, E. (1997). The double binds of whiteness, In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. Powell, & L. Wong (Eds.), *Off white: Readings on race, power, and society* (pp. 259–269). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *The wretched of the earth*. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Fischer, R. (2009). Foucault's challenges to critical theory in education. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 190–204). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Foucault, M. (1965). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason* (R. Howard, Trans). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archeology of the human sciences*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A poststructural reader*. London: RKP.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. (2nd ed.) (pp. 208–226). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1989). *The archeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.) London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: Vol I An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1991). How an experience-book is born. *Remarks on Marx: Conversations with Duccio Trombadori* (R. J. Goldstein & J. Cascaito, Trans). New York, NY: New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1994a). What is enlightenment? (C. Porter, Trans.). In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault* (pp. 43–57). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1994b). Nietzsche, genealogy, history (C. Porter, Trans.). In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault* (pp. 351–370). New York, NY: The New Press.

- Foucault, M. (1994c). The subject and power (C. Porter, Trans). In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault* (pp. 126–145). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Freire, P. (1971). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Seabury.
- Gillborn, D., & Youdell, D. (2000). *Rationing education: Policy, practice, reform, and equity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gore, J. (1995). On the continuity of power relations in pedagogy. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 5(2), 165–188. Taylor & Francis Online
doi.org/10.1080/0962021950050203
- Griffiths, M., Bass, L., Johnston, M., & Perselli, V. (2004). Knowledge, social justice, and self-study. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell, (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 651–708). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Guilfoyle, K. (1992, April). *Student teaching as a teacher educator. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association*, San Francisco, CA.
- Hamilton, M. L. (1992, April). *Student teaching as a teacher educator. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association*, San Francisco, CA.
- Ham, V., & Kane, R. (2004). Finding a way through the swamp: A case for self-study as research. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell, (Eds.),

- International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 103 – 151). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Haviland, V. (2008). “Things get glossed over” rearticulating the silencing power of whiteness in education. *Journal of Teaching Education*, 59(1), 40–54.
- Heron, B. (2007). *Desire for development: Witness, gender and the helping imperative*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Hill, L. (2007). *The book of Negros*. New York, NY: HarperCollins
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress. Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- hooks,b. (2000). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Hunt, S., & Holmes, C. (March 2015). Everyday decolonization: Living a decolonizing queer politics. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 19(2), 154–172. Retrieved May 16, 2015.
- Hyttén, K., & Warren, J. (2003). Engaging whiteness: How racial power gets reified in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(1), 65–89.
- Jhally, S. (Director). (1998). *Edward Said on Orientalism*. [Video]. USA: The Media Education Foundation.
- Jhally, S. (Director). (1999). *Tough guise: Violence, media & the crisis in masculinity* [Documentary]. USA: The Media Education Foundation.
- Jhally, S. (Director). (2010). *Killing us softly 4: Advertising’s image of women* [Documentary, Short]. USA: Rise Up Films.

- Johnson, A. (1997). *The gender knot: Unraveling our patriarchal legacy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (1996). In the service of what? The politics of service learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77, 1–15.
- Kailin, J. (1999). How white teachers perceive the problem of racism in their schools: A case study in ‘liberal’ Lakeview. *Teachers College Record*, 100(4), 724–750.
- Kanu, Y. (2006). Introduction. In Y. Kanu (Ed.), *Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imaginations* (pp. 3–29). Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Kennelly, J. (2009). Good citizen/bad activist: The cultural role of the state in youth activism. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 31(2–3), 127–149.
- King, T. (2003). *The truth about stories: A Native narrative*. Toronto, ON, Canada: House of Anasi Press.
- Kobayashi, A., & Peake, L. (2000). Racism out of place: Thoughts on whiteness and an antiracist geography in the new millennium. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 90(2), 392–403.
- Korthagen, F., & Lunenberg, M. (2004). Links between self-study and teacher education reform. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell, (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 421–449). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

- Kovach, M (2013). Treaties, truths and transgressive pedagogies: Re-imagining Indigenous presence in the classroom. *Socialist Studies/ Etudes Socialistes*, 9(1), 109–125.
- Kumashiro, K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(1), 25–53.
- Kumashiro, K. (2004). *Against common sense: Teaching and learning toward social justice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kumashiro, K. (2009). Teaching teachers to teach queerly. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 718–721). New York, NY: Routledge.
- LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 817–871). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate W. F. (2009). Toward a critical race theory of education. In A. Darder, M. P. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 167–182). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of ‘white privilege.’ *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), 137–152.
- Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Loughran, J. J., Hamilton, M. L., LaBoskey, V., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2004). *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Loughran, J. J. (2004). A history and context of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 7–14). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Lunenberg, M., Zwart, R., & Korthagen, F. (2010). *Critical issues in supporting self-study. Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(6), 1280–1289.
- MacDonald, K. (2006). Learning whose nation? In Y. Kanu (Ed.), *Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imaginations* (pp. 260–282). Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Mackey, E. (2002). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Marx, S. (2004). Exploring and challenging whiteness and white racism with white pre-service teachers. In V. Lea & J. Helfand (Eds.), *Identifying race and transforming whiteness in the classroom* (pp. 132–152). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- McClintock, A. (1995). *Imperial leather: Race, gender and sexuality in the colonial contest*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McLean, S. (2007). *Beyond the pale: Whiteness as innocence in education*. Masters Thesis. University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK.
- McLean, S. (2013). The whiteness of green: Racialization and environmental education. In T. McCreary, R. Basu, & A. Godlewska, *Canadian geographer: The critical geographies of education* (pp. 354–362). Canadian Association of Geographers.

- McNinch, J., Totten, M., & Thompson, S. (2005). Que(e)rying inclusive practice: Exploring and challenging homophobia in curricula and schools. Project #125, *Teaching and learning research exchange*. Regina, SK, Canada: Dr. Stirling McDowell Foundation for Research into Teaching.
- McWilliam, E. (2004). What does it mean to feel like teaching?. In Baker, B. M., & Heyning, K. E. (Eds.), *Dangerous coagulations: The use of Foucault in the study of education* (pp. 135-150). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Meyer, E. (2007). “But I’m not gay”: What straight teachers need to know about queer theory. In W. Pinar & N. Rodriguez (Eds.), *Queering straight teachers: Discourse and identity in education* (pp. 15–29). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Milner, H. R. (2007). Race, culture, and researcher positionality: Working through dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational Researcher*, 36(7), 388–400.
- Mitchell, C., & Weber, S. (2005). Just who do we think we are . . . and how do we know this?: Re-visioning pedagogical spaces for studying our teaching selves. In C. Mitchell, S. Weber, & K. O’Reilly-Scanlon (Eds.), *Just who do we think we are? Methodologies for autobiography and self-study in teaching* (pp. 1–8). London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Montgomery, K. (2005). Banal race-thinking. Ties of blood, Canadian history textbooks and ethnic nationalism. *Pedagogica Historica*, 41(3), 313–336.
- Morgensen, S. L. (2010). Settler homonationalism: Theorizing settler colonialism within queer modernities. *GLQ*, 16(1–2), 106–131. DOI: 10.1215/10642684-2009-015.

- Nagel, J. (2000). Masculinity and nationalism: Gender and sexuality in the making of nations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(2), 242–268.
- Ndimande, B. S. (2010). Critical theory as social justice pedagogy. In T. K. Chapman & N. Hobbel (Eds.), *Social justice pedagogy across the curriculum: The practice of freedom* (pp. 89–103). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ng, R. (1993). Racism, sexism, and nation building in Canada. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity and representation in education* (pp. 50–59). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ng, R. (2003). Toward an integrative approach to equity in education. In P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change* (pp. 163–183). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Norquay, N. (1993). The other side of difference: Memory-work in the mainstream. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 6(3), 241–251.
- North, C. (2008). What is all this talk about “social justice”? Mapping the terrain of education’s last catchphrase. *Teachers College Record*, 110(6), 1182–1206.
- North, C. E. (2007). What do you mean by ‘anti-oppressive education’? Student interpretations of a high school leadership program. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(1), 73–97. doi: 10. 1080/0951839 0600924246
- Northfield, J., & Loughran, J. (1997, March). *The nature of knowledge development in the self-study practice*. Monash University, Australia. Paper presented at the American education research association annual meeting in Chicago, IL.

- O'Haire, N. (2008). *Education for social justice*. Ottawa, ON, Canada: Canadian Teachers Federation.
- Parkes, R. J., Gore, J. M., & Ellsworth, W. (2010). After poststructuralism: Rethinking the discourse of social justice pedagogy. In T. K. Chapman & N. Hobbel (Eds.), *Social justice pedagogy across the curriculum: The practice of freedom* (pp. 9–35). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Picower, B. (2012). *Practice what you teach: Social justice education in the classroom and on the streets*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pinnegar, S. (1992, April). *Student teaching as a teacher educator*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Pinnegar, S. (1998). Methodological perspectives: Introduction. In M. L. Hamilton et al. (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education*. (pp. 31–33). London: Blackwell Press.
- Pinnegar, S., & Hamilton, M. L. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research: Theory, methodology, and practice*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Pithouse, K., Mitchell, C., & Weber, S. (2009). *Self-study in teaching and teacher development: A call to action*. *Educational Action Research*, 17(1), 43–62.
- Placier, P. (1992, April). *Student teaching as a teacher educator*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Plewes, B., & Stuart, R. (2007). The pornography of poverty: A cautionary fundraising tale. In D. A. Bell & J. Coicaud (Eds.), *Ethics in action: The ethical challenges of international*

- human rights nongovernmental organizations* (pp. 23–37). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Prado, C. (2000). *Starting with Foucault: An introduction to genealogy*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (1994). Introduction: Foucault today. In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault* (pp. vi–xxxv). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Raby, R. (2004). There is no racism in my school, it's just joking around: Ramifications for antiracist education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 7(4), 367–384.
- Rankin, L. P. (2000). Sexualities and national identities: Re-imagining queer nationalism. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 35(2), 176–194.
- Razack, S. (1998). *Looking white people in the eye: Gender, race and culture in courtrooms and classrooms*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Razack, S., Smith, M. & Thobani, S. (2007). Introduction. In Razack, S. Smith, M. & Thobani, S. (Eds), *States of race: Critical race feminism for the 21st century* (pp. 1–23). Toronto, ON, Canada: Between the Lines.
- Razack, S. (2008). *Casting out: The eviction of Muslims from western law & politics*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Richardson, G. (2006). Reimagining curriculum as third space. In Y. Kanu (Ed.), *Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imaginations* (pp. 283–299). Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Said, E. (2003). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.

- Sandretto, S. (2009). Theoretical and methodological tensions in a post-structural, collaborative self-study research project. *Studying Teacher Education: A Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*, 5(1), 89–101.
- Saskatoon Public School Division. (2007). Applied Global Citizenship 30: A locally developed course (pp. 1–28). Saskatoon, SK.
- Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. (2003). *Safe schools: Breaking the silence on sexual difference*. Saskatoon, SK, Canada: STF.
- Schick, C. (2000a). 'By virtue of being white': Resistance in anti-racist pedagogy. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 3(1), 84–102.
- Schick, C. (2000b). White women teachers accessing dominance. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 21(3), 299–309.
- Schick, C., & St. Denis, V. (2005). Troubling national discourses in antiracist curricular planning. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28(3), 295–317.
- Sensoy, O., & DiAngelo, R. (2012). *Is everyone really equal?: An introduction to key concepts in social justice education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Smith, A. (2010). Queer theory and native studies: The heteronormativity of settler colonialism. *GLO: A Journal of Gay and Lesbian Studies*, 16(1), 41–68.
- Srivastava, S. (2005). "You're calling me a racist?": The moral and emotional regulation of antiracism and feminism. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 31(1), 29-62.
University of Chicago.

- Stanley, T. J. (2006). Whose public? Whose memory? Racisms, grand narratives and Canadian history. In R. W. Sandwell (Ed.), *To the past: History education, public memory, and citizenship in Canada* (pp. 32–49). Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- St. Denis, V., & Schick, C. (2003). Critical autobiography in integrative antiracist pedagogy. In L. Biggs & P. Downe (Eds.), *Gendered intersections: An introduction to women's and gender studies* (pp. 387–392). Halifax, NS, Canada: Fernwood.
- St. Denis, V. (2004). Real Indians: Cultural revitalization and fundamentalism in aboriginal education. In C. Schick, J. Jaffe & A. M. Watkinson (Eds.), *Contesting fundamentalisms* (pp. 35–45). Halifax, NS, Canada: Fernwood.
- St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing Aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through multiculturalism: “There are other children here.” *Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 33(4), 306–317.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2000). Poststructural feminism in education: An overview. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(5), 477–515.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2004). Care of the self: The subject and freedom. In Baker, B. M., & Heyning, K. E. (Eds.), *Dangerous coagulations: The use of Foucault in the study of education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Stoler, A. (1995). *Race and the education of desire: Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Straubhaar, R. (2014). The stark reality of the “white savior” complex and the need for critical consciousness: A document analysis of the early journals of a Freirean educator. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 45(3), 381–400.

- Strong-Wilson, T. (2006). Re-visioning one's narratives: Exploring the relationship between researcher self-study and teacher research. *Studying Teacher Education*, 2(1), 59–76.
- Tan, L. (2009). The 5 E's of emancipatory pedagogy: The rehumanizing approach to teaching and learning with inner-city youth. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 485–496). New York, NY: Routledge.
- The Canadian Teachers Federation handbook on Education for Social Justice. (2008). Ottawa, ON, Canada.
- Theilen-Wilson, L. (2012). *White terror, Canada's Indian residential schools and the colonial present: From law towards a pedagogy of recognition. Published dissertation*. Toronto, ON, Canada: OISE, University of Toronto.
- Thobani, S. (2007) *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Thompson, A. (2003). Tiffany, friend of people of color: White investments in antiracism. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(7), 7–29.
- Valencia, R. (2010). *Dismantling contemporary deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Walia, H. (2013). *Undoing border imperialism*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Warren, T. J. (2001a). Doing whiteness: On the performative dimensions of race in the classroom. *Communication Education*, 50(2), 91–108.
- Warren, J. T. (2001b). The social drama of a 'rice burner': A (re)constitution of whiteness. *Western Journal of Communication*, 65(2), 184–205.

- Weber, S., & Mitchell, C. (2002) Academic literary performance, embodiment, and self-study: When the shoe doesn't fit: Death of a salesman. *Making a Difference in Teacher Education Through Self-Study*, 2, 4–125.
- Weems, L. (2004). Troubling professionalism: Narratives of family, race, and nation in educational reform. In B. M. Baker & K. E. Heyning (Eds.), *Dangerous coagulations: The use of Foucault in the study of education* (pp. 225-256). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimization of exploitation*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Williams, J., & Ritter, J. K. (2010). Constructing new professional identities through self-study: From teacher to teacher educator. *Professional Development in Education*, 36, 77–92.
- Wilson, A. (1996). How we find ourselves: Identity development and two-spirited people. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(2), 303–317.
- Wilson, A. (2007). N'tacimowin inna nah': Our coming in stories. *Canadian Women Studies*, (Spring) 26(2), 193–199.
- Wilson, A. (2013). How we find ourselves: Identity development and two-spirit people. In S. Ferguson (Ed.), *Race, gender, sexuality and social class. Dimensions of inequality* (pp. 303-318). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wolf, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387–409.

- Youdell, D. (2005). Sex-gender-sexuality: How sex, gender and sexuality constellations are constituted in secondary schools. *Gender and Education*, 17(3), 249–270. London: Routledge.
- Youdell, D. (2006a). Subjectivation and performative politics—Butler thinking Althusser and Foucault: Intelligibility, agency and the raced-nationed-religioned subjects of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(4), 511–528.
- Youdell, D. (2006b). *Impossible bodies, impossible selves: Exclusions and student subjectivities*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Youdell, D. (2010). Performativity: Making the subjects of education. In Z. Leonardo (Ed.), *Handbook of cultural politics and education* (pp. 219–236). New York, NY: Sense Publishers.
- Zembylas, M., & Boler, M. (2002). On the spirit of patriotism: Challenges of a “Pedagogy of Discomfort.” Special Issue on Education. *Teachers College Record Online*.

Appendix A

Title: “Talking Back”: Teacher and student subjectivities and counter-narratives in public schools.

Letter of Invitation

My name is Sheelah McLean and I am a Ph.D. Candidate and a teacher employed by the Saskatoon Public Board of Education. I am presently researching former high school students who were registered in my Global Citizenship 30 program from 2007-2010.

You are invited to be involved in an interview as part of this research. This opportunity will help educators to better understand how integrative social justice pedagogies support students understanding of local and global social and environmental justice issues.

Your participation will be in the form of an interview approximately two hours in length. It will be conversational in style and include approximately eight open-ended questions. The interview will take place at a location of your choice. You will receive a copy of the interview schedule and a consent form in advance of the interview. With your permission the interview will be audiotaped. At any time during the interview, you may ask to turn off the recorder and ask that notes not be made of what you say. The audio recordings and notes will be typed (transcribed) and the typed copies (transcripts) will then be returned for your review and signed approval. You are free to change anything that you believe was mis-transcribed, misinterpreted, or even those things which you said but you no longer agree with. With your permission I will also be using excerpts from your class assignments as data for the research. Your right to withdraw data from the study will apply until you have signed approval of the transcripts and class assignments. The data collected in this interview will be used to complete my dissertation research. The results of the findings may be used for publications in academic and professional journals and for presentations at conferences. You will be provided with an electronic copy of the thesis upon completion.

This research study has been approved by the Research Ethics Board of the University of Saskatchewan on (DATE). If you have any concerns about the ethics of this study, you may contact them at (306) 966-2084. If you are out of town, you may call collect.

Please contact my research supervisor or me at the email addresses below if you are interested in learning more about this study.

Researcher: Sheelah McLean Sheelah.Mclean@usask.ca

Research Supervisors: Dr. Verna St. Denis verna.stdenis@usask.ca

Dr. Alexandria Wilson alex.wilson@usask.ca

Thank you for your interest!!!

Appendix B

Title: “Talking Back”: Teacher and student subjectivities and counter-narratives in public schools.

CONSENT FORM

You have been invited to participate in a research study titled, “Talking back”: Teacher and student subjectivities and counter-narratives in public schools. Please read this form carefully, and feel free to ask any questions you might have.

Researcher/Student: Sheelah McLean 306-280-3245

Supervisors: Verna St. Denis, Ph.D., and Associate Professor in Educational Foundation. College of Education, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 0X1. Ph. 306-966-2734. Alexandria Wilson, Ph. D. and Assistant Professor in Educational Foundation. College of Education, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S&N OX1. Ph. 306-966-7549.

Purpose: The aim of this study is to document the experiences of youth that have graduated from my Global Citizenship 30 course, which seeks to focus on integrative antiracist anti-colonial education.

Procedure: You will be provided through email a copy of the interview schedule and consent form in advance of the interview. You will decide the location of the interview. The researcher requests that the interviews will be audiotaped. At any time during the interview you may request that the recording device be turned off. The time commitment for the interview is approximately two hours. You will be provided with a transcript of your interview to review. You can make any corrections, deletions, additions or other changes you may want to make to your transcript. You will then be asked to sign a transcript release form. At this time you may decide to opt in or out of the study. Signing the transcript release form indicates your agreement to include your data in the study.

Potential Risks and Confidentiality: I understand my participation in this study is completely voluntary and that my participation will remain confidential, including reporting of the data and any discussion, public presentation or written reports. My identity will be protected through use of pseudonyms. I understand and expect that any personal and/or identifying information and/or direct words that may compromise my identification will be altered to protect my identity, for example, no identifying information (e.g., specific names and locales of schools, or staff) will be revealed in the reporting of the research or data. I am aware the researcher may use quotations from the interview and subsequently I may be identifiable based on what I have said. I understand and am aware that this research is not designed to guarantee anonymity but will provide confidentiality.

Potential Benefits: Participation in this study will provide an opportunity for students to speak openly regarding their educational experiences in social justice education, which can enhance our understanding of using integrative antiracist anti-colonial pedagogies. The researcher cannot guarantee any personal benefits from participating in this study.

Storage of Data: In accordance with the University of Saskatchewan guidelines, all data (field notes, tapes and artifacts) will be securely stored in a locked cabinet in Dr. Verna St. Denis's office (College of Education, Rm. 3088) for a minimum of five years. Five years after the date of completing this research, audio tape recordings and identifying information linking transcripts to the participant will be destroyed beyond recovery. While the researcher is in the field, all data collected will be kept in a password protected laptop. Paper copies of transcripts with any related or identifying data will be kept in the personal office of the researcher.

Right to Withdraw: I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the study for any reason, at any time, without penalty of any sort. I understand that if, at any time prior to signing the transcript release form, I choose to withdraw from the study that any data I have contributed will be destroyed at my request.

I understand that the reporting of that data will be completed by October 2012 and that an electronic copy of the report will be made available to me upon completion.

Release of Data: By signing this consent form I authorize the release of all data that I have contributed to this study. I understand that, prior to signing the transcript release form, I may ask that all or specific data I contributed be removed and destroyed at my request.

Questions: If I have any questions concerning the study, I am free to ask at any point; I am free to contact the researcher at the number provided above if I have questions at a later time. This study has been approved on ethical grounds by the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board on (DATE). Any questions regarding my rights as a participant may be addressed to that committee through the Ethics Office (966-2084). Out of town participants may call collect.

Consent to Participate: I have read and understood the description provided above; I have been provided with an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered satisfactorily. I consent to participate in the study described above, understanding that I may withdraw this consent at any time or ask that some or all of my data be removed from the study. A copy of this consent form has been given to me for my records.

I consent to allow my class assignments to be used as part of the data for the research study.

_____.

I consent to have my name published in the dissertation and other subsequent publications.

_____.

(Name of Participant)

(Date)

(Signature of Participant)

(Signature of Researcher)

Appendix C

Title of Study: “Talking back”: Teacher and student subjectivities and counter-narratives in public schools.

Interview Schedule

Student Experiences

1. What were your experiences in the Global Citizenship 30 program?
2. What are some of your most vivid memories from the class?
3. What were some of the most important things you learned?

Perceptions/Experiences of self and social justice education

1. Did the class shift or alter your perceptions of social justice? If so, how?
2. Were you engaged in forms of activism before you took the class? Did your engagement change after the class? Explain.
3. Did the class shift or alter your perception of yourself? If so, how?
4. Are you still involved in social justice initiatives or activism? Explain.
5. Is there any material from the program that you think should be mandatory in schools?

Appendix D

Transcript Release Form

Title: "Talking back": Teacher and student subjectivity and counter-narratives in public schools.

I, _____, have reviewed the complete transcript of my personal interview in this study, and have been provided with the opportunity to add, alter, and delete information from the transcript as appropriate. I acknowledge that the transcript accurately reflects what I said in my personal interview with Sheelah McLean. I hereby authorize the release of this transcript to Sheelah McLean to be used in the manner described in the Consent Form. I have received a copy of this Data/Transcript Release Form for my own records.

Participant

Date

Signature of Participant

Signature of Researcher